DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 120 IR 053 724

TITLE	Information at Risk: Michigan Libraries in the 1990's.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Library, Lansing.
PUB DATE	Oct 88
NOTE	129p.; For a review of the task force recommendations, see ED 333 881.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Libraries; Elementary Secondary Education; *Financial Support; Higher Education; *Information Technology; Learning Resources Centers; Library Automation; *Library Cooperation; *Library Planning; Library Role; *Library Services; Public Libraries; School Libraries; Shared Resources and Services; Special Libraries; *Statewide Planning; Technological Advancement
IDENTIFIERS	*Michigan

ABSTRACT

In June 1987 the Library of Michigan Board of Trustees appointed a special task force on library interdependency and funding whose charge was to formulate recommendations and methods for achieving adequate services by and funding for Michigan libraries. The first three sections of the report provide a brief introduction and statement of the problem, the names of the task force members, and the details of the full charge to the task force. The fourth section presents the task force's special and major recommendations deemed to be the most significant. The fifth section lists all of the recommendations from each of the subcommittees by subject category, i.e., Interdependency, Funding, Library of Michigan, Statewide Library Card, Structure, and Technology, and by priority within these categories. The last four sections present the reports and recommendations from the subcommittees on academic, public, school, and special libraries. (MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Library of Michigan

ED333612

Information at Risk:

Michigan Libraries in the 1990's

Prepared by the

Library of Michigan Board of Trustees Task Force on Interdependency and Funding

October 1988

IR053724

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dennis C. Cullinan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Representative Lewis N. Dodak, Chair
Senator John M. Engler, Alternate Chair

Senator Dan DeGrow
Senator Gilbert DiNello
Senator William Faust
Senator Rudy J. Nichols
Senator Richard Posthumus
Representative Michael J. Griffin
Representative Teola P. Hunter
Representative James A. Kosteva
Representative Gary L. Randall
Representative John G. Strand

ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Representative Tom Alley
Representative Robert Bender
Representative H. Lynn Jondahl
Senator Fred Dillingham
Senator R. Robert Geake
Senator Michael J. O'Brien
Elliott Smith, Secretary

LIBRARY OF MICHIGAN BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Jeanne Thomas, Chair
Reverend William C. Ardrey,
Vice-Chair
Dorrine Anderson
Leo Dinnan
Senator Jack Faxon
Marianne Gessner
Peter M. Kempel
Barbara Kormelink
Representative James A. Kosteva
Howard Lipton
Representative Glenn Oxender
Robert Raz
Chief Justice Dorothy Comstock Riley
represented by Al Lynch
Senator William A. Sederburg
Elliott Smith

James W. Fry, Secretary

LIBRARY OF MICHIGAN

James W. Fry, State Librarian
Jeffrey P. Johnson, Deputy State Librarian
Donald C. Leaf, Director, Administrative Services Division
Charles B. Wolfe, Director, Law Library Division
Sharon Rothenberger, Director, Library Development Division
Stephanie Perentesis, Director, User Services Division

Table of Contents

Section 1

Introduction and Background 1

Section 2

Task Force Members 9

Section 3

Charge 13

Section 4

Special and Major Recommendations
    Special Recommendations 19
    Major Recommendations 21

Section 5

Task Force Recommendations
    Interdependency 31
    Funding 37
    Library of Michigan 40
    Statewide Library Card 50
    Structure 52
    Technology 56

Section 6

Academic Libraries Subcommittee Report 61
Academic Libraries Subcommittee Recommendations 79

Section 7

Public Libraries Subcommittee Report 85
Public Libraries Subcommittee Recommendations 106

Section 8

School Libraries Subcommittee Report 113
School Libraries Subcommittee Recommendations 121

Section 9

Special Libraries Subcommittee Report 125
Special Libraries Subcommittee Recommendations 135

Section 1

Introduction and Background

Introduction and Background

A. Introduction

The Library of Michigan Board of Trustees appointed a special Task Force on Library Interdependency and Funding in June of 1987. The Task Force was asked to:

> "formulate recommendations for adequate and equitable services by and funding of Michigan libraries and suggested methods by which these may be achieved."

The full charge given to the Task Force appears in the third section of this report.

Task Force members were appointed by Howard Lipton, then Chair of the Library of Michigan Board of Trustees. During the eighteen months of the study there were a number of resignations from the Task Force. Two of the four subcommittee chair appointments were changed during the study and several new Task Force members were appointed. The final Task Force membership list includes the names of the individuals who contributed to this report.

The Task Force was divided into four subcommittees by types of libraries.

Academic Libraries	Margaret E. Auer, Chair
Public Libraries	David Leamon, Chair
School Libraries	Burton H. Brooks, Chair
Special Libraries	Robert Gibson, Chair

The Task Force members acknowledge the special dedication and time commitment of these individuals.

B. Statement of the Problem

Michigan's residents are seeking more information than ever before to meet their needs for research, business, education, problem-solving, and self-fulfillment, and libraries of all types are facing increased difficulties in trying to meet these needs.

In recognition of this inability of Michigan's libraries to keep up with the increasing needs of our residents and to determine what it would take to meet these needs, the Task Force was created to deal with two important issues – the **funding** and **interdependency** of Michigan's libraries. This assignment by the Library of Michigan Board of Trustees is also a recognition that libraries of all types in Michigan are dealing with funding problems and that libraries have had a long tradition of depending on one another for additional resources in order to meet the needs of users.

The past ten years have been especially difficult ones for Michigan's libraries. While funding sources have eroded, the demands for services have increased. The development of computerized circulation systems and electronic card catalogs, telefacsimile transmission of documents, electronic databases, CD-ROM products and other technological innovations have strained the ability of many library budgets to provide for these services. Although these service improvements are costly, they are becoming more and more a necessary part of the delivery of quality library services to Michigan's citizens.

In addition to increasing costs for technology, the costs for library materials including books, periodicals, and audiovisual materials have reduced the ability of most Michigan libraries to maintain their collections. For example, public libraries in Michigan added 930,775 volumes in 1985 compared with 1,810,509 in 1970. This is a 49% decrease in items purchased.

The escalating cost of periodicals – especially scholarly research items – has had a devastating effect on the ability of college, university and special libraries in Michigan to purchase these increasingly more expensive items. This concern is addressed in a recent article in Library Journal which indicates the scope of the problem:

> "We are seeing what we call 'information shock' which is analogous to the 'energy shock' of a few years back ... Prices have increased well in excess of inflation rates and publishing costs."[1]

The problem adds up across the state with a result that such collections are getting older, out-of-date, and less helpful to Michigan residents. Libraries are important state resources. They must be adequately and properly supported in order to guarantee citizen access to up-to-date information.

We are at the beginning of an era that will depend more and more on good quality information and education. Economic expansion and the ability of the state to compete in a national and especially a world market requires adequate information resources. The state's educational system from elementary school classrooms to post-graduate university courses needs good libraries to support the educational curriculum and process. Future success will more and more depend on our ability to seek, find, and use information. Librarians are trained to do just that, but they will need resources with which to work.

Librarians have been innovators and leaders in the field of automation of information and in the sharing of information with each other. Interdependency is alive and still developing in Michigan. Through the efforts over a number of years by the Michigan Library Consortium, the Library of Michigan, the Library Cooperatives, the Regional Educational Media Centers,

---

[1] Dougherty, Richard M. and Johnson, Brenda L. "Periodical Price Escalation: A Library Response." Library Journal, May 15, 1988, Vol. 113, No. 9.

Regions of Cooperation and various state library organizations, all types of libraries have come together to share resources and technology to serve Michigan's citizens, but much more still needs to be done.

The development of the Regions of Cooperation (ROCs) is an example of this interdependency. The ROCs are established state regions funded with Federal Library Services and Construction Act funds which bring all types of libraries (public, school, academic and special libraries) in 14 designated areas of the state together to share resources.

The Task Force surveys have indicated that the ROCs are important for all types of libraries and that they should be strengthened. Libraries are interested in further development and improvement in sharing resources. This is an important area for state participation and funding because the benefits go directly to the users, mostly citizens of the State of Michigan.

The Task Force envisions a strengthening of the Regions of Cooperation, major improvements in electronic communication among all types of libraries – including online access to a majority of the state's library collections and electronic delivery of information for immediate access by the library user.

In order for libraries to survive and to give adequate service to users, there must be better communication links and access to collections of other libraries.

If we concentrate on the issue of library service from the point of view of the individual user, we have the key to developing improved services. The user needs information but does not really care where it is coming from. The library needs to know where it is available and needs a means to deliver the materials and information as quickly as possible to the user.

Libraries now are for the most part taking on the burden of sending their own materials to other libraries at a cost to themselves. There is really a disincentive to cooperate and share resources because of the local cost involved. Libraries with the most resources or with unique resources, are net service providers. There is a need to recognize this cost burden and develop a state funding mechanism for adequate reimbursement of net lenders.

Through the efforts of the Task Force, all types of libraries in Michigan were called together to look at the problems we have in common and to develop a course of action towards a solution to these problems. We have had a chance to look at ourselves and at each other and we have determined we are more alike than separate and that we can improve service to the individual user by improving our ability to work more closely with each other.

There is a definite need for better coordination on a statewide level to move libraries from the current situation to a more organized effective network. Leadership and coordination must come from the Library of Michigan with proper funding provided by the legislature. All types of libraries have worked together to improve the delivery of library service to Michigan's citizens but the tenuous thread holding this together now is a dependency on federal dollars. State funding must replace federal dependency – both in the budget of the Library of Michigan and for the support of the Regions of Cooperation. The role of the state should be to provide for the efficient delivery of library services across all types of libraries to benefit the individual citizen. Funding from the state which provides additional materials for libraries as well as providing the best mechanism for delivery of items from library to library by conventional or electronic means, benefits all citizens.

C. Former Studies and Reports

The work of the Task Force involved the study of all types of libraries in Michigan. A review of several other studies and reports on libraries done in the past indicated that most of them concentrated on public libraries. The exceptions to this were the 1979 Michigan White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services and the December 1980 Plan for Restructuring Interlibrary Loan in Michigan.

Besides the above-mentioned documents, a number of former studies were reviewed. These included the Hudzik report, (Hudzik, John K. A Fiscal and Organizational Analysis of Public Libraries in Michigan, 1970), four library studies done by the Michigan Department of Education from 1971 through 1975, and the Report and Recommendations of a Task Force to Study the State Library, completed for the Michigan Library Association in August, 1981.

The Task Force reviewed the Library of Michigan Act (P.A. 540, 1982) which created the Library of Michigan and placed it under the Legislative Council, as well as the draft copy of the Library of Michigan Long Range Plan, October 1988 to September 1991. The Report of the Governor's Commission on the Future of Higher Education in Michigan, December 1984, was also examined for recommendations relating to libraries. One of these recommendations stated that the estimated cost "for connecting academic libraries through automation ... and a plan for funding this automation" be established.

In this review the Task Force has recognized that the seeds for positive change often times appeared to be buried within the reports or studies, but without them and the efforts that followed there would not be a Library Cooperative Act (P.A. 89, 1977), a newly organized Library of Michigan (P.A. 540, 1982), and the construction of a new Library of Michigan facility, or the Regions of Cooperation for the sharing of resources among all types of libraries.

D. The Library of Michigan Act (P.A. 540, 1982)

In reviewing the Library of Michigan Act, the Task Force noted that under Section 10 of the Act, the "Duties of the Library" are outlined. Among these duties are several which pertain specifically to the areas dealt with by the Task Force. These are given below to show that there is already in existence a legislative mandate for the Library of Michigan to perform specific functions for libraries in Michigan.

"Section 10 ...

f) Further, by all appropriate means, the development of effective, statewide school library services.
g) Encourage contractual and cooperative arrangements between and among all kinds of libraries for the improvement of library services to the people of this state.
h) Coordinate the library's library services with the library services of all kinds of libraries.
i) Collect, preserve, and publish appropriate statistics on all kinds of libraries in the state.
j) Conduct research and publish the results for the benefit of all kinds of libraries and the library services to the people of the state ...
l) Under the authority granted by law, promote and advance library science in the state."

E. Task Force Surveys and Statistical Analysis

The Task Force Subcommittees developed a general survey instrument which was mailed to all types of libraries in the state, including academic, public, special, and school libraries. An attempt was made to contact all known libraries in the state except for school libraries which were done on a sampling basis because of the very large number of school libraries. A special statistical analysis of the school libraries was completed by the University of Michigan School of Information and Library Studies. The academic libraries also developed a statistical survey form to gather information about staff, collections, and services to Michigan's academic libraries.

A large body of information was gathered and is available for review at the Library of Michigan for those who desire to examine in detail the work of the Task Force. This includes the statistical information, survey reports and other items used by the Task Force. This information has not been appended to the Task Force report in order to keep the report short enough to allow for the widest possible dissemination as well as to put the major emphasis where it belongs – on the Task Force recommendations and the reports of the subcommittees. Each of the subcommittees used the information and advice gathered from libraries around the state to develop their individual reports and recommendations. The reader is strongly advised to read the narrative reports of each of the subcommittees in order to put the recommendations into the proper context.

The survey and statistical work done by the Task Force Subcommittees pointed to a very important need to improve the gathering, compilation, and printing of this information for all types of libraries. One of the responsibilities outlined in the legislation creating the Library of Michigan is to "collect, preserve, and publish appropriate statistics on all kinds of libraries in the state". A good job has been done for public libraries but not for other types of libraries in the state. There is a need to improve statistics gathering and publishing for all types of Michigan libraries. This will require additional resources and staff at the Library of Michigan, but it is essential to have better information in order to determine needs and direction.

The survey indicated that many librarians are frustrated because of lack of local resources, geographic isolation, and the press of local demand. This was true in all types of libraries. But what also surfaced from the surveys was an indication that there is a need for cooperation and coordination that can bring all types of libraries together to better serve Michigan's citizens. The role of the State needs to be one of encouragement towards increased cooperation coupled with workable monetary incentives that can provide the mechanism for it.

Perhaps, one of the most positive results from the survey work done by the Task Force was a reinforcement of the existence of a cooperative spirit among all types of libraries in Michigan. There is a recognition that we all must work together in order to deliver the best possible service and that this is an important area for state involvement and support.

F. Leadership Role of the Library of Michigan

The Task Force members recognize that the backbone of good library service is local responsibility, control and support whether it be in the school library, public library, college, university, community college or in special libraries serving hospitals, businesses or state institutions. But there are many areas in which cooperation among libraries is necessary. Some of these areas include the identification of special subject collections, preservation of materials, last copy storage, applications of new technology, electronic storage and retrieval of collection information, a statewide collection database, fast delivery of information and materials from library to library and accurate statewide statistical and directory information about Michigan's libraries.

The Library of Michigan was identified by all types of libraries as being in the best position to provide the necessary leadership for libraries in the state. This can be a subtle and sometimes hard to define concept because each library is an independent entity. Yet again and again in the Task Force surveys, the Library of Michigan was identified as the one institution that could be the catalyst for better coordination and cooperation.

Libraries are ready to work more closely with the Library of Michigan and the key seems to be a true partnership and mutual trust which means real involvement of the libraries.

Although additional funding is also one of our recommendations for improving the state's library services, we want to place major emphasis on the important role of the Library of Michigan in nurturing this library partnership. There is much to be done but we must all be involved.

The specific recommendations of the Task Force follow in Sections 4. and 5.

Section 2

Task Force Members

Library of Michigan

Board of Trustees
Task Force on Library Interdependency/Funding

Member	Institution	Subcommittee
Ms. Margaret E. Auer	Michigan Library Association - University of Detroit	Academic - Chair
Mr. Burton H. Brooks	Grand Haven Public Schools Media Services	School - Chair
Ms. Gloria Coles	Flint Public Library	Public
Ms. Jean Curtis	Detroit Public Library	Public
Mr. Leo Dinnan	Wayne/Oakland Library Federation	Public
Mr. Kevin Flaherty	Michigan Library Consortium	School
Mr. Robert Gibson	General Motors Institute Library (Retired)	Special - Chair
Dr. George Grimes	Regional Educational Media Center (REMC) 20	School
Ms. Paulette Groen	Special Libraries Association - Society of Manufacturing Engineers (Library)	Special
Dr. Charles Hanson	Grosse Pointe Public Library	School
Ms. Sue Hill	White Pine Library Cooperative	Public
Mr. Christian Holmes	Bay De Noc Community College Learning Resource Center	Academic
Mr. Theodore Keffer	Michigan Library Association Trustees Division Board	Public
Mr. David Leamon	Jackson District Library	Public - Chair
Mr. Lee Lebbin	Michigan Technological University	Academic
Ms. Carolyn McMillen	Michigan State University Library	Academic
Dr. Joseph Mika	Wayne State University Library School	Academic
Ms. Nardina Nameth	Henry Ford Hospital Library	Special
Ms. Eleanor Pinkham	Kalamazoo College Library	Academic
Mr. Robert Raz	Grand Rapids Public Library	Task Force - Chair
Ms. Susan Williams	Northland Library Cooperative	Public
Ms. Patricia Olsen Wilson	Rochester Hills Public Library	Public
Mr. Charles Wolfe	Library of Michigan State Law Librarian	Special

Ex-Officio Members

Ms. Jeanne Thomas	Chair, LM Board of Trustees
Reverend William C. Ardrey	Vice-Chair, LM Board of Trustees
Mr. James W. Fry	State Librarian

Library of Michigan Staff

Mr. Jeffrey P. Johnson	Deputy State Librarian
Mr. Donald C. Leaf	Director, Administrative Services
Ms. Ruth H. Dukelow	Library Establishment Specialist
Ms. Ilene Schechter	Reference Librarian
Ms. Tina Deitrich	Secretary

Section 3

Charge

CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE ON INTERDEPENDENCY/FUNDING

The charge of the Board of the Library of Michigan to the Task Force on Library Interdependency/Funding is:

To formulate recommendations for adequate and equitable services by and funding of Michigan's libraries and suggested methods by which these may be achieved, for consideration and approval by the Board of the Library of Michigan. Discussion of possible recommendations shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Services that are provided by each type of library in Michigan and how libraries depend on and cooperate with each other in serving their constituencies.
2. Library services needed by Michigan citizens.
3. Funds necessary to support these services.
4. Mechanisms for assuring funds.

The report should also include:

A. Documentation of current library relationships.

B. Funding sources and current dollar support.

C. A review of other states' services and funding plans.

D. Document long-range service and technology needs and funding to meet these needs.

E. Develop plans to meet funding and service needs.

F. Recommend a process for implementation.

Section 4

Special and Major Recommendations

Special and Major Recommendations

A. Special Recommendations

These three special recommendations are placed in a separate category because they were deemed to be of the most significant importance by the Task Force and should be taken as a minimum responsibility of the legislature in support of library services for the citizens of Michigan.

	Recommendation	**Explanation**
1.	**The Task Force recommends that State funding for the Library of Michigan be increased to completely remove the Library of Michigan from reliance on Federal dollars for operations.** **1989 Cost — $1,000,000**	The Library of Michigan has depended on federal funds for operations for many years. In the past few years the dependency on federal dollars has been reduced from 70% federal support to 30% federal support, but any dependency at all on federal dollars is dangerous. The federal funds should be used more creatively – to provide for innovative services for the entire state. An example of how such federal funds could better be used appears below in a recommendation to establish a statewide library card. Federal funds could be utilized to provide start-up costs for such a project.
2.	**The Task Force recommends that the operational budget of the Library of Michigan be increased to provide needed library resources and adequate staffing levels.** **For library resources (books, periodicals, reference, electronic databases, etc.)** **1988 Cost — $500,000** **For library staff (increased service levels and collection maintenance)** **1988 Cost — $500,000**	The Library of Michigan has a sorely inadequate materials budget which cannot even provide sufficient service for the informational needs of the legislature – the first service priority for the Library of Michigan. The collection must be strengthened by adding new items and providing for purchase of retrospective titles. This includes not only books, periodicals, documents and other printed materials, but also software, electronic reference resources, microforms and state-of-the-art technology for storage and retrieval of information. Additional staff will be needed for selecting, cataloging and maintaining the collection and for providing service to the library's users as well as to meet the legislative mandates for the Library of Michigan. The new building should be adequately staffed and open extended service hours beyond the normal work day and should include Saturday and Sunday hours.

Recommendation

3. **The Task Force recommends that the subregional libraries serving Michigan's blind and handicapped citizens receive state funding adequate to provide library services to these individuals.**

1989 Additional Cost — $720,000*

***Current Support Level — $280,000; Total Funding Needed for This Activity — $1,000,000**

Explanation

Library service to Michigan's blind and handicapped residents is now provided in the following manner. Federal funds through the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., provide for free recorded books and magazines. The Library of Michigan and Wayne County Library are designated as regional libraries by the Library of Congress and the Library of Michigan has designated 12 subregional libraries for the blind and handicapped which have been established in public libraries across the state.

The Task Force sees the provision of this service as primarily a state responsibility because the subregional libraries serve large geographic areas beyond their own local service boundaries. Local funds will still be committed to this service but the state should be taking a much stronger funding responsibility. This is a unique service to our citizens who have no other way to enjoy reading other than through recordings or braille. For this reason we place important emphasis on this recommendation.

B. Major Recommendations

These five major recommendations were the top choices of the subcommittee chairs of the Task Force and were listed by each of the chairs individually as the five top choices. They are listed in priority order and the list has been approved by the entire Task Force.

Recommendation

1. State Aid to Public Libraries and Library Cooperatives

The Task Force recommends that Public Act 89, 1977, "The State Aid to Public Libraries Act", be funded at a 1989 level of $1.00 per capita in each of the three categories of State Aid as listed in Sections 13, 16(2) and 16(4) of the Act; that the geographic density factor in Section 16(4) be increased from $10.00 to $30.00; that the county reimbursement for head librarian's salary be increased from $4,800 to $15,000 in Section 16(5) with the county contribution to the library increased from $3,600 to $10,000.

1989 Additional Cost — $17,900,000*

***Current Support Level — $10,600,000; Total Funding Needed for This Activity—$28,500,000**

Mid-West State Aid Comparison

State	State Aid FY 1987	Per Capita
Illinois	$30,500,182	$2.64
Indiana	$1,858,095	$.34
Michigan	$10,600,000	$1.15
Ohio	$207,373,790	$19.29
Wisconsin	$8,615,500	$1.79

Explanation

Public Act 89, 1977, is the act which provides for the establishment and funding of Michigan's library cooperatives and for state aid grants to public libraries meeting established standards. When originally passed, the Act provided a 50¢ per capita funding formula which still has not been fully funded. (The current level in 1988 is just 37¢ per capita.) Public libraries and library cooperatives are efficient users of state funds. The money is used to provide for direct services to library users and to improve cooperative efforts and efficiencies among libraries. Cooperative computer networks, delivery services, interlibrary loan, shared collection development, cooperative purchasing of books and equipment and reference services are some of the services established to improve the efficiency of library service delivery to Michigan's citizens.

The Task Force recommendation to increase the formula in the Act to $1.00 per capita (in 1988 dollars) is still viewed as a minimum level of necessary state support for public library services. Much is expected of public libraries in meeting the informational needs of students – especially in the pre-school through high school level. Additional demands come from adults needing a variety of information from research to recreational reading.

Also important in the recommendation is the increase in the density support factor. Cooperatives which now have fewer than 75 persons per

Recommendation **Explanation**

square mile receive $10.00 per square mile in state aid. Raising this figure to $30.00 per square mile helps to establish a more reasonable operating base for cooperatives serving rural areas.

Increased state support helps strengthen all public libraries and the cooperatives which are the important mechanisms tying libraries together for resource sharing. When this interdependency is strengthened by improved state funding, all Michigan residents benefit.

2. Regions of Cooperation

The Task Force recommends that the Regions of Cooperation (ROCs) be formalized through legislation by amending Public Act 89, 1977, with the inclusion of a funding provision for the ROCs. This amendment should be written to provide a means for the Cooperative to use these specially designated funds to develop and improve resource sharing among all types of libraries. The means for the representative involvement of all types of libraries in developing the Region's plan for service and its on-going operation would be provided in the amendment to the act and plans for these services would be approved and maintained by the Library of Michigan.

1988 Cost — $2,500,000

There are fourteen Regions of Cooperation (ROCs) which now cover the entire state and match the boundaries of existing public library cooperatives. The ROCs, however, are the vehicle for providing service to all types of libraries (academic, public, school, and special libraries). ROCs are established and funded through the Library Services and Construction Act Title III, a federal act which provides funds for multitype library cooperation. The Library of Michigan administers the state's plan for this federal act and is responsible for approving plans in each region for how these resource-sharing dollars will be spent.

The Task Force surveys have indicated that libraries of all types are interested in strengthening the Regions of Cooperation in order to provide for improved resource sharing for the benefit of library users. The fact that federal dollars are now the only support for the ROCs is seen as a threat to their future survival.

The recommendation to fund the ROCs by revising P.A. 89 is seen as the best way to strengthen library interdependency without creating another separate entity and its inherent bureaucracy.

Experience with the federally funded Regions of Cooperation has shown that the services of all types of libraries can benefit when resources are identified and shared. The future vision is for improved computer access to all collections within a region, fast delivery service by vehicle or electronic means for certain types of information as well as for other types of resource sharing – all to benefit residents of each region in obtaining better access to information resources.

The Task Force recommends state funding for this interdependency activity because it will provide incentives for resource sharing from the larger libraries and small libraries with special collections who are often reluctant to do so because of increased local costs.

3. Statewide Library Card

The Task Force recommends the establishment of a statewide library card as a method for improving access for Michigan's citizens to all of the resources and information housed in Michigan's libraries. The program should include an incentive for reimbursement for participating libraries and, perhaps, be modeled on the State of Pennsylvania library card program — ACCESS PENNSYLVANIA.

The Task Force recommends that the Library of Michigan be provided with seed funding of $100,000 for the purpose of studying the Pennsylvania plan and implementing this program in Michigan. (Note: If the First Special Recommendation of the Task Force – to provide state funds to take the Library of Michigan off dependency on federal funds – is implemented, this project could be seeded by using federal funds.)

1988 Cost — $100,000

One of the purposes of this Task Force was to work towards breaking down some of the barriers that prevent Michigan's citizens from obtaining needed information resources. This particular recommendation was made separately by each of the Task Force Subcommittees which is a recognition of the importance of this recommendation. The symbolic significance of a statewide library card cannot be underestimated. It is our hope that once established, the card will help improve access to all types of libraries.

The Task Force recognizes that there must be a sensitivity to local situations where each community (whether it be a college, city, village, school, private library, etc.) may choose to participate in this activity. That is the reason we are recommending that the Library of Michigan investigate the Pennsylvania plan which provides a financial incentive to libraries for participation. This is important because it recognizes the need for local autonomy yet works positively toward cooperation.

The Task Force members agree that an aggressive stand by the Library of Michigan Board of Trustees to pursue this particular recommendation would be a very positive step toward improved library service to Michigan's citizens and that it would help to strengthen library interdependency in Michigan.

4. Resource Sharing

a. **The Task Force recommends the completion of the union listing of serials holdings for Michigan libraries and the annual on-going maintenance costs.**

1989 Cost for Annual Maintenance — $16,000

1989 Cost for Telecommunication Fees — $250,000

Beginning in the early 1980's, a union list of serials held by Michigan libraries was begun. This database is being entered by participating libraries by means of a national library bibliographic utility (OCLC) and has improved the ability of libraries in Michigan to verify holdings in libraries and to obtain copies of articles from other libraries more quickly.

This is an interdependency issue that is deserving of state support to both develop and maintain the database because it benefits users in every part of the state, enabling them to obtain library resources.

The statistics below show that OCLC interlibrary loan usage has tripled in six years. As union listing data become more widely available, more use will occur.

OCLC Interlibrary Loan Usage
July - June

Year	Usage	Percent
1983	33,186	
1984	48,876	+47%
1985	69,128	+44%
1986	84,875	+28%
1987	88,850	+5%
1988	106,485	+20%

b. **The Task Force recommends the establishment of a statewide library database.**

Cost — Further study is needed.

Holdings information of all libraries in Michigan should be made available to the user quickly and easily. Instantaneous verification of another library's holdings allows for faster response for the user. By developing online databases at each library and providing interfaces or dial access to other library holdings, resource sharing will be more easily achieved. Consideration should be given to the expansion of the MERIT network, or other electronic communication links, so all types of libraries could use the system for resource sharing. The Library of Michigan should take a leadership role in this area and develop software which would allow diverse systems to be accessed (e.g. CLSI with NOTIS).

There are over 22 million items in academic libraries and over 21 million items in public libraries. Although statistics for holdings in school and special libraries are incomplete, we know that several million more items are in these collections.

c. **The Task Force recommends that a financial incentive program be established to provide matching funds for libraries with inadequate local resources to become a part of the statewide database through the provision of current technology and equipment.**

Cost — Further study is needed.

Although it is the primary responsibility of the local library to provide for equipment to meet local needs, there are many places where these funds are lacking. Matching funds could be provided through the Federal Library Services and Construction Act to assist libraries with start-up funding for the necessary hardware and software to allow the library to become a part of the statewide database.

5. School Libraries

a. **The Task Force recommends the publication by the Library of Michigan of the results of the statewide library survey of Michigan's school libraries with the widest possible dissemination to the education and library community and the State Legislature.**

Cost — $7,500 – $10,000

The Task Force survey results identified school libraries as being in the most critical condition among all types of libraries in Michigan. There is no more important place for our children to develop a lively interest in reading than in the very place they are learning to read and yet our surveys paint a dismal picture of the condition of most of our elementary school libraries in Michigan. Outdated collections, a lack of trained professional staff, limited space and access to existing collections, no after school hours – all of these seem to be the common denominator of our elementary school libraries. We place so much emphasis on teaching our children to read

Recommendation **Explanation**

and then we are not providing the needed reading materials.

Educational research shows that children who develop early reading habits – those who are introduced to books and libraries and who use them – become lifelong readers. There is so much excellent literature available for children and it should be available in our elementary and secondary school libraries where the children are. Public libraries cannot do the job alone. Elementary and secondary school libraries should be strengthened in order to develop the foundation for Michigan's library services.

In order to strengthen our school libraries we see a need for the Library of Michigan to assist our educators (the Department of Education, the State Board of Education, our state's school boards and superintendents) to understand the state of our school libraries and the important role they could provide if strengthened.

The Task Force is aware of the fact that the Library of Michigan was recently a part of the Department of Education and that there needs to be a sensitivity to the proper role of the Library of Michigan, but we see the need to develop good communications with the Department of Education – especially in this most important area of elementary and secondary school library services.

The Library of Michigan does have a legislative mandate to gather information about school libraries. The dissemination of this information can become a key to improving school libraries at all levels – from elementary through high school. There is a need for advocacy by the Library of Michigan in this area, as well as to develop effective school libraries statewide by all appropriate means.

	Recommendation	Explanation
b.	**The Task Force recommends the implementation of the recommendations in Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* for Michigan schools.**	This recent publication provides excellent information which can be used by Michigan schools and the State Board of Education to work toward the improvement of school library media centers. It covers, in detail, how the school library media centers should be staffed, resources and equipment needed, facilities and space needs, and responsibilities of local, regional and state educators. Dissemination of this publication, along with the publication of the school library surveys, will show that there is a way to work toward improving school library media services for our children.

---

*Published by American Library Association and Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1988.

Section 5

Task Force Recommendations

This is a listing of the entire recommendations from each of the subcommittees divided into subject categories and prioritized by the Task Force within these categories

Interdependency

		Recommendation	Narrative
1.	S	**Recommend that support be provided for statewide library cooperation, especially interlibrary loans and resource sharing as an area development tool.**	Survey results indicate a wealth of library resources that have been relatively untapped because their existence was not widely known. Much of this information can be shared to the benefit of Michigan's residents by statewide interlibrary loaning. Support is needed to prepare a database that all libraries can utilize to locate the items.
2.	A	**Recommend that union listing of all libraries' serial holdings into a statewide online database be a high priority goal for the state. The Library of Michigan should develop a mechanism for funding start-up costs and, more importantly, request funds from the State of Michigan to cover the annual storage fees for maintenance of the information in the database.**	The building of the statewide union list of serials database through the OCLC national bibliographic utility has been underway since the early 1980's. The building of the database has enhanced the statewide sharing of resources particularly through interlibrary loan programs. In order to increase Michigan libraries' capacity to participate in resource sharing, serial union listings must be maintained and enhanced in the future. Annual storage fees are currently approximately $10,651 for all libraries, however, an anticipated fifty percent increase in the next year will raise the cost to $15,977.
3.	S	**Recommend that funding and resources be provided to enable the smaller public libraries and special libraries to include their holdings in existing union lists.**	The majority of special libraries are small, as are many public libraries. Yet these libraries contain many items of unique value. Because of their limited resources, it is almost impossible for most of these libraries to commit part of their budgets toward the cost of inputting the information into a statewide database. State funding support would increase the overall value of the database.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
4.	A	**Recommend funding be provided to improve access to information databases throughout the state.**	It is the primary responsibility of the parent institution to increase its academic library funding to support the purchase of hardware, software, and staff training when developing database services. However, in regions where these services are greatly lacking, the Library of Michigan could support the start-up funding with the use of LSCA funds. An ongoing program of information and evaluation of various databases would be helpful to the academic community in determining which to subscribe to or access. Likewise, the Library of Michigan should work with other groups to assure that all areas of the state have economical telecommunications access to database locations.
5.	A	**Recommend that the State of Michigan provide direct financial support to academic libraries which participate in programs of cooperative access and resource sharing to patrons who are not part of their primary clientele, that is, registered students, and faculty and staff of the institution.**	Academic libraries receive funding from the parent institution to service their faculties and students. Services to others are essentially being underwritten by the institution. Academic libraries which are net lenders through interlibrary loan, which service walk-in patrons not associated with the academic institution, or which participate in other resource sharing activities should have the costs of those extra services compensated by the State of Michigan. State funding of telecommunications costs associated with resource sharing, such as accessing state or national networks (e.g., OCLC, RLIN, WLN), or the use of telefacsimile equipment are additional examples of how state government can provide much needed assistance. 1987-88 OCLC telecommunication costs for libraries in Michigan is $225,250. An anticipated 6% increase each year for the next two years will increase the amount paid to $251,481. The

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			statewide effort of resource sharing needs additional planning, coordinating and documentation. The Library of Michigan is in the best position to organize this effort in a manner not burdened with unnecessary paperwork. Likewise, the Library of Michigan should administer the funding for reimbursing academic libraries for services they provide the citizens of the State of Michigan.
6.	A	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan coordinate a statewide program for the purpose of identifying and converting to machine readable form special and unique cataloged collections.**	Throughout the state there are special and unique collections which have been cataloged locally which generally provide local access only. To enhance resource sharing by providing increased bibliographic access to these valuable collections, the existing cataloging records should be converted to machine readable form and the data added to a common database such as OCLC. The Library of Michigan should petition for special funding to accomplish this recommendation.
6.	P	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan assume full responsibility for publishing and emphasizing all special collections housed in public libraries throughout Michigan.**	From the survey conducted as a part of the Task Force on Interdependency and Funding Public Library Subcommittee, a number of important and unique special collections were revealed that previously had little or no publicity. The special collections, if organized and published fully throughout the state, could become a valuable resource for sharing to all types of libraries in Michigan. They represent a little known, but potentially strong asset which needs attention and promotion.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
6.	S	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan issue a new separate publication listing special collections in Michigan's libraries. Such a listing would provide increased information for Michigan's residents.**	Little information is currently available about the "special collections" which are a part of all types of libraries' holdings. Frequently these collections are not even in the library's cataloged data. Survey returns identified the existence of these "special collections". If a comprehensive description of these materials and their availability to Michigan's residents were included in a publication, a considerable new body of information would become available for research.
7.	S	**Recommend development of a plan to promote cooperative collection development as a way to "stretch" libraries' funds for materials.**	The Library of Michigan should take the lead in developing a plan to encourage contributions by all types of libraries into a common pool of funds which could be spent to purchase very expensive items which most libraries cannot afford by themselves. These materials could be placed in the Library of Michigan or other designated location. By following such a plan, such items would be available to all Michigan residents.
8.	A	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan coordinate a statewide program for the purpose of preserving valuable research and information materials located in Michigan libraries.**	Since it is not economically feasible for most libraries to establish and maintain preservation facilities, a cooperative statewide effort should be made, and funding should be provided by the State of Michigan. The long-term goal should be the establishment and maintenance of a centralized preservation and conservation facility. The short-term goal should be to secure funding to preserve, by binding or preservation microfilming, those information and research materials selected as worthy of preservation. In order for

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			Michigan to be in the forefront in this area, a Task Force on Preservation should be created to put preservation activities into motion.
9.	A	**Recommend development of reference sources in the local library (particularly CD-ROM) and coordinated implementation of reference services at the regional and state level.**	The Library of Michigan should set up test sites or model installations as an experimental program to determine the economics and cost effectiveness of a CD-ROM program in an academic library setting. The test site would also be funded to provide demonstrations to other institutions and answer questions relating to the CD-ROM products: frequency of use, hardware available, reliability, etc. If there are positive cost-effective results from the test sites, the Library of Michigan should coordinate the initiation of at least one site in each region of cooperation.
10.	P	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan fund statewide information and reference referral centers.**	The major research libraries as defined by P.A. 371 of 1972, could be designated as reference referral centers and each assigned a geographic and/or subject area as a primary responsibility. These reference centers would be used as a backup resource for information requests which cannot be filled through small libraries and cooperatives. They would encourage stronger networking among types of libraries as well as stimulate resource sharing.
11.	S	**Recommend development of a statewide plan for centralized storage of older, lesser used library materials. A method for rapid delivery of needed items is a requisite of the plan.**	Most special libraries have serious space problems and are forced to remove books from their collections regularly. Many of these items are still valuable but are no longer of immediate interest to the library and must be disposed of to make space. A central location for storage of withdrawn, but still valuable items would allow libraries to use their space more effectively, but

Recommendation	Narrative
	would also keep these items available in the state. Magazine and journal runs could be handled in the same manner. A method for rapidly distributing copies of journal articles or parts of books via "fax" to libraries in Michigan would provide an important service to all.

Funding (Exclusive of Resource Sharing)

		Recommendation	Narrative
1.	S	**Recommend that the State of Michigan increase its funding to the Library of Michigan so that the library can adequately fulfill its mission of leadership for all types of libraries in Michigan.**	The Library of Michigan should expand its leadership, educational, and coordination role for all types of libraries. It is only natural that the library community of Michigan should look to the Library of Michigan as their internal leader. The Library of Michigan is uniquely qualified to fulfill this role. However, it is also imperative that the Library of Michigan receive sufficient funding for this role.
2.	P	**Recommend that Public Act 89, 1977, "The State Aid to Public Libraries Act", be funded at a 1989 level of $1.00 per capita in each of the three categories of State Aid as listed in Sections 13, 16(2) and 16(4) of the Act; that the geographic density factor in Section 16(4) be increased from $10.00 to $30.00; that the county reimbursement for head librarian's salary be increased from $4,800 to $15,000 in Section 16(5) with the county contribution to the library increased from $3,600 to $10,000.**	In order to meet the Constitutional mandate that public libraries shall allow access to their resources to all of the residents of the State of Michigan, public libraries need to receive stronger state support. In 1987, only 7.6% of the income to public libraries came from state support, yet their doors are open to all residents of the state, students and faculty of colleges and universities, as well as public school students. Public libraries must meet minimum requirements and belong to a library cooperative before they may receive state aid. Public libraries are the primary access to information for the majority of the residents of the state, yet they receive minimal support to allow them to strengthen library collections, access networks, implement automation programs and participate in greater resource sharing activities. Stronger funding through cooperatives is one way in which public library service can be dramatically improved.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
3.	A	**Recommend development of a planned use of Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Title III funds.**	As the Library of Michigan completes its first federal audit of LSCA Title III funding and programs, it should develop a plan with region participation for how future funding will be made available for multitype activities. Will the LSCA Title III funds be reserved for the ROCs? Will monies be made available to other groups (such as a grouping of academic libraries) whose program ideas serve multitype resource sharing? What will happen to the regional structure if LSCA funds are discontinued? All libraries need to know the plan in order to effectively participate.
4.	P	**Recommend that state grants be given to libraries serving populations under 25,000 that hire a director with an ALA accredited MLS degree.**	Public service may remain substandard in many ways if smaller libraries do not receive incentives which warrant stronger leadership and professional management. State aid grants to libraries serving smaller populations would provide the incentive to hire professional librarians to organize and direct the operations of library services and give stronger emphasis to the full range of information options to the public.
5.	P	**Recommend that public libraries should receive matching incentive grants from the state for all funds expended for library materials in excess of a minimum percent of their annual budget.**	An incentive program implemented at the state level which would provide matching dollars as an incentive to public libraries to boost materials budgets would greatly improve library collections statewide. For example, the incentive could be divided by class size for libraries. A minimum percentage for a class 6 library could be 12% of the total budget, for example, and a state grant could be awarded in increments for everyone meeting the minimum annual expenditure. This

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

Recommendation	Narrative
	would encourage library boards to allocate adequate funds for materials so that they would qualify for incentive grants. It would also discourage libraries from making cuts in their materials budgets in order to fund other programs.
6. P **Recommend that state aid grants should be given to district libraries that have been organized and that meet minimum standards.**	The emphasis for this recommendation is to encourage the district library concept as a stronger alternative for smaller libraries. The future life of many small and isolated public libraries may depend upon local governments working together, rather than separately, through the formation of district libraries serving a larger geographical area, but providing a strong consolidated library service. Grants through the state would encourage townships, villages, cities and counties to consider a consolidation effort and formation of district libraries. Stronger resource sharing, collections, and overall library service would result in a better network of public libraries throughout Michigan.

Library of Michigan

		Recommendation	Narrative
1.	P	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan should, with established guidelines, fund through the state all of the Subregional Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.**	Once primarily a service provided through the state library, service to the blind and physically handicapped has now been established in subregional libraries in various locations throughout the state. Funding is not adequate to support the basic service and the libraries must pull funding from local library budgets to provide the minimum levels of service to our residents. Funding for this service should come through the state in sufficient amounts to fully fund the service without impacting local library budgets. Current service can best be described as sub standard, minimal, and totally inadequate as we move towards the future and higher numbers of older Michigan residents. The Library of Michigan should either assume the full responsibility for adequate funding for each of the subregional libraries or resume both housing and administration of the programs at the state level.
2.	P	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan promote a strong, joint leadership role between itself and all types of libraries within the state.**	Networking, resource sharing, interdependency...all can only be achieved with strong support and leadership through the Library of Michigan. Public libraries need to be recognized and valued for the unique and important role they assume in dealing with the residents of the state. Public libraries need to become an integral part of the network of libraries serving all of the residents of Michigan. The responsibility for bringing all libraries together, promoting them, and advancing them into the future as a model for other states to see and follow belongs to the Library of Michigan.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
3.	P	**Recommend that the growing dependency between public libraries and school libraries throughout the state be studied by the Library of Michigan.**	Many public libraries are finding an ever increasing demand to act as the school library in many communities. This is due to the increasing budget cuts in school programs which either reduces school library budgets and personnel, or eliminates them altogether. Albeit, the public library serves all of the public, but it is caught in the dilemma of serving the full-range needs for students and teachers without any additional funding to support the strong and growing demand for materials and services. A joint study between the Library of Michigan and the State Department of Education could be undertaken as an interdependency effort to determine the scope of the problem and possible recommendations for funding support or other solutions.
3.	SC	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan actively and widely publicize the critical status of hundreds of Michigan school library/media center programs by disseminating the results of the 1988 school library survey to the State Board of Education, local boards of education, professional educational associations, and particularly, to the general public.**	A close examination of the surveys used to collect data about school library/media programs revealed an extremely gloomy picture of the school library programs in Michigan. To best understand the problems, actual study of the survey results is required. School libraries are the basis for all library programs in Michigan – if we don't start out students with good school libraries which help them grow and understand the value of libraries, we will soon have an unenlightened citizenry which, in the future, may well not support libraries, whatever the type. Furthermore, on a more immediate basis, the Task Force has recommended greatly increased cooperation and networking among all types of libraries and, unless school library resources are im-

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

Recommendation **Narrative**

proved, they will not be effective contributors to proposed cooperative, networking efforts. True interdependency mandates strong local units before cooperative efforts can be successful. Additionally, poor school libraries create a negative drain on all other types of libraries, particularly public and academic libraries. This drain creates service problems for public and academic libraries which have traditionally cooperated with school libraries, but are not equipped to replace them, which is rapidly becoming reality in some parts of the state.

Finally, in order to begin immediate rectification of the problem, a recommendation should be made to the Department of Education and Legislature that a portion of school aid be earmarked for school library/media center programs with funds being made available for both materials and staff. Incentives should be part of the funding package to encourage school districts to provide matching funds to those provided in the state school library/ media center aid package.

Only by providing funding help as part of the school aid package will the real importance of school library media centers be recognized and the problems therein start being solved.

		Recommendation	Narrative
4.	SC	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan actively promote implementation of guidelines in the recent publication of Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) and American Association of School Librarians (AASL), Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs, particularly with respect to funding and staffing for school media centers.**	New national guidelines for library media programs were adopted by the American Library Association (through the American Association of School Librarians division) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology earlier this year. These **Information Power** guidelines replace the previous 1975 standards. The new guidelines emphasize program concept and structure on a qualitative basis. Quantitative standards are subordinate to the key concepts advocated. A "benchmark" opportunity is available to improve school library media services through implementation of the AASL/AECT **Information Power** guidelines, with particular regard to necessary staff and fiscal support.
5.	A	**Recommend the Library of Michigan provide the service of annually gathering appropriate statistics from the academic libraries in Michigan.**	The Library of Michigan should work with academic libraries to develop an effective instrument for the gathering of statistics within the academic community. Then, the Library of Michigan should gather, compile, and publish such information on an annual basis.
5.	S	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan continue to annually collect and analyze statistical data from all types of libraries.**	The Library of Michigan has had a responsibility for collecting statistical information about the various Michigan libraries. However, most of their effort has gone to the public libraries as these statistics have been required for fund allocations. The Task Force Survey has provided initial statistics for all types of libraries and the Library of Michigan should continue collecting and analyzing similar statistics annually.

		Recommendation	Narrative
5.	SC	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan continue to collect, to maintain and to provide a statistical analysis of all types of Michigan libraries for the purpose of providing current factual information about Michigan libraries.**	Except for the area of public library statistics, there has been no consistent collection of statistical data about the various types of Michigan libraries which would provide historical documentation and comparative analysis. Librarians seek comparative data in order to gain a clearer understanding about funding, staffing, budget, and technology. A consistent collection of library statistics can provide libraries with an opportunity not only to gain a better understanding of other libraries within the state but also an opportunity to collect and to analyze statistical data at the local level.
6.	P	**Recommend that new standards for quality public library service be created by the Library of Michigan working jointly with public libraries in the state.**	Using both input and output measures, but including some basic checklist requirements, new standards need to be created and set for different degrees of excellence in public libraries. Standards should vary according to the population size (small, medium, large public libraries), level of quality for library service, and with an incentive program encouraging all public libraries to meet higher standards. New standards would include an incentive funding program for libraries as they improve quality of collections, local funding, excellence in the standards for service and standards for staffing. Present standards and funding for state aid would continue with no change until new standards were established and implemented concurrent with increased funding at the suggested $1.00 per capita level.

		Recommendation	Narrative
6.	P	**Recommend that an accreditation process for public libraries be established with a funding incentive for those meeting the standards for accreditation-with-excellence.**	As an incentive for improving local services, funding, and programs, an accreditation process would be established which would outline minimum standards for adequate-to-excellent levels of service. The accreditation and standards would be created to reflect the size and role of each library. Libraries meeting an "above average" level of service as defined by the process, would be accredited with distinction and would receive an additional 5¢ per capita. Libraries meeting "excellent" ratings would receive accreditation with the highest distinction and would receive 15¢ per capita. Accreditation would provide an excellent incentive for communities to work to maintain and build stronger local funding for public libraries, and it would also provide excellent public relations and promotional opportunities. Libraries could apply for accreditation and if approved would hold same for a 3 to 5 year period.
7.	P	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan assume an active advocacy role for all types of libraries in Michigan.**	Public libraries cross all of the boundaries of age, ethnic, social and economic boundaries as they serve the broad needs and interests of the public. They have been mandated by the Constitution to serve all residents regardless of where they reside. The demands on service and collections require that public libraries have strong representation and support through the Library of Michigan. The Library of Michigan needs to demonstrate a stronger advocacy role for public libraries and work with the legislature to strengthen library funding, technological development, resource sharing, and public library visibility in Michigan.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
8.	SC	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan work actively for the benefit of children and youth in our state through school and public library programs.**	The Library of Michigan is charged in Public Act 540 to develop effective, statewide school library services "by all appropriate means". To date, the Library of Michigan has limited direct efforts related to school library media programs and centers to collecting statistics to be "preserved and published." As school library media centers are the most numerous libraries in the state, serving a very active, captive user group which also represents the future of adult patronage, it is incumbent on the Library of Michigan to facilitate services to the children and youth of Michigan. If our children are our future, they should experience the best possible public as well as school library experiences.
9.	S	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan develop a plan to both inform and change the current image that Michigan residents have of their libraries.**	The survey results indicated that many librarians felt a strong need for a public relations program that would inform Michigan residents of the vast library resources and services available to them. The old images of libraries as mere storehouses of old books and of librarians who are there only to check out books or to collect fines are still prevalent. The Library of Michigan should help to change this image.
9.	SC	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan take a collaborative role in promoting the value and image of Michigan libraries and librarians, their inter-relationships, and their value to students and to the public.**	The Library of Michigan is the "number one library" in Michigan related to public recognition. The new building will increase citizen awareness of the institution of the Library of Michigan. With this base of citizen support and recognition, the Library of Michigan is in a perfect position to actively promote Michigan libraries of all types, librarians, and their inherent value

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			to all residents of Michigan. The promotion should use all print and electronic media to saturate Michigan with the library message.
10.	SC	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan develop effective inter-departmental cooperation with the Department of Education, under whose supervision Michigan school libraries currently takes place, with specific endorsement of the MAME legislation (P.A. 141, 1988) for the establishment of a school library media center advisory committee.**	The School Libraries Subcommittee recognizes that when the Library of Michigan and Department of Education were separated from each other that the responsibility for school library/media center development was not assumed by either agency. However, with the passage of P.A. 141, 1988, which recognizes school library media centers, it is also time for the Library of Michigan and State Department of Education to work together in whatever avenues possible. In short, it is imperative that both agencies achieve a high degree of cooperation and coordination in their approach to school library/media center programs so that maximum effectiveness can be realized and costly duplication avoided.
11.	A	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan initiate an internship program and provide financial assistance to develop individuals for professional positions.**	There are a significant number of professional positions which are difficult to fill and for which qualified applicants cannot be found. The state should assist in a program that would provide encouragement to libraries to identify individuals from within their libraries for enrollment in library school. Providing inducements for libraries to send staff members to library school, and providing financial assistance through scholarships and paid internship positions, would allow the library to "home-grow" individuals for current positions, for future vacancies, and for long-range planning. Up-state and rural libraries, which have the most difficult time in recruiting professionals, would benefit through a

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			policy which requires a specified period of employment in a library following the completion of studies.
11.	S	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan fully utilize its unique position to survey the educational needs of the state's librarians and to coordinate programs to meet these needs.**	The Library of Michigan is in an excellent position to coordinate continuing library education. The Library of Michigan should survey the educational needs of the state's librarians. A unified calendar of educational opportunities from all library groups would increase awareness of available programs as well as to help avoid unnecessary duplication of workshops.
11.	SC	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan recognize the difficulties that school library/media center personnel encounter in participating in staff development activities, and take an active role in coordinating and making available library staff development in order to provide for continuing opportunities for staff training and education.**	Staff development activities geared to the needs of school library media specialists are available only in limited numbers in Michigan. The closing of Western Michigan University's librarianship program along with curtailment of off-campus offerings by the University of Michigan create hurdles for persons seeking additional professional training. The Library of Michigan, working in cooperation with universities providing library training, professional organizations such as MAME, and the Michigan Department of Education should spearhead professional training opportunities for school library media professionals on a statewide basis, particularly Northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula.
12.	S	**Recommend that a new position be established on the Library of Michigan staff to coordinate special library services.**	A staff position should be created to unify services for the special library segment of the library community. The position should be filled by a special librarian. Such an addition to the staff would benefit the Library of Michigan's understanding of special libraries, their problems, and their potential contribution to all libraries.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
12.	SC	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan support the designation of a school library media consultant within the Department of Education, and appoint a staff person of the Library of Michigan as official liaison with the Department of Education for school library cooperative activities.**	The School Libraries Subcommittee recommends that a staff person of the Library of Michigan be appointed as official liaison with the Department of Education for school library cooperative activities. This individual shall assist the Library of Michigan in fulfilling its mandate to gather and analyze statistics relative to school library/media centers. This individual shall likewise assist both Departments to monitor compliance with approved standards for school library/media centers. This individual would serve as a contact person for personnel in school library/media centers for consultant services related to interlibrary cooperation.
13.	A	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan coordinate grant proposal writing for groups of libraries.**	Smaller academic libraries have neither the staff nor the expertise required to develop appropriate grant proposals. The Library of Michigan should facilitate the preparation of proposals when the awarding of the desired funds would enhance resource access, resource sharing, or improved services for the public.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

Statewide Library Card

		Recommendation	Narrative
1.	A	**Recommend the development of a state-supported, statewide library card system for use in all libraries.**	Access Pennsylvania, a statewide card first implemented in 1985 in the state of Pennsylvania, has received excellent press coverage and reviews. A universal card, state-supported, printed by the state, that allows on-site borrowing would encourage and facilitate usage by our clients, the citizens of Michigan. Participating libraries would receive funding based on their participation, circulation of materials by clients who are "non-local library patrons", interlibrary loan processing, and interlibrary loans filled. Study of the Pennsylvania plan is recommended. The coordinator of this program and the facilitator for acquiring state funding should be the Library of Michigan.
1.	P	**Recommend that a statewide library card be established in Michigan for use in all types of libraries.**	In accordance with the Constitutional mandate that all public libraries be accessible for use by all of the citizens of our state, it is recommended that we study the example implemented in Pennsylvania called, "ACCESS PENNSYLVANIA". The system was initiated in 1986 in 23 counties on a trial basis and in 1987 it was extended to all 67 counties of the state. It allows any person registered as a resident to borrow materials at a participating library without fee. The success of the program has reported an average 10% increase in the use of library materials since the barriers have been removed. Compensation is paid by the state to libraries lending materials to other libraries when it is not practical for clients to visit them. The reimbursement compen-

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			sation covers the full cost of lending materials and thus eliminates the fees which are normally charged to the clients. Cost for delivery of the materials is also subsidized by the state. A library card in Pennsylvania opens 600 public libraries and 22 million books to residents of that state. True resource sharing has been achieved.
1.	S	**Recommend the establishment of a statewide library card as a method of improving patron access to the state's information.**	One hurdle preventing the public's use of our state's library resources is the lack of a statewide library card. Although many special libraries do not allow circulation of some of their materials, others do, and the lack of any mechanism hinders full use. Some compensation should be available to offset costs of the increased volume of transactions. The Pennsylvania Plan should be studied as a model of one plan that has worked.
1.	SC	**Recommend support of a statewide library card, with use of this card tied to incentive reimbursement for the participating libraries.**	A first step toward statewide interdependency of libraries would be the issuance of the statewide library card – the ticket to use any library. Though some school boards may object to use of school library materials by the general public, probably the greater number of boards may see the value of wider use of school library resources. Additionally, greater public awareness of not only school library collections, but all types of collections may be a fringe benefit of the statewide library card. Incentive funding for libraries which lend materials to "non-residents" in large numbers would encourage all libraries to participate.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

Structure

		Recommendation	Narrative
1.	A	**Recommend the evaluation of the regions of cooperation in regards to the role they have played, are performing, and should take in multitype cooperation.**	The Library of Michigan should develop more definitive guidelines for the regions of cooperation. If they are to be the means for multitype library development within the state, the regions of cooperation need to be structured to assure that they are multitype in organization and operation. Additionally, the Library of Michigan should determine an on-going base of support (state funding) for the regions of cooperation if they are to perform the function of multitype library development. A clear articulation of the role of the regions of cooperation by the Library of Michigan is a needed and necessary first step.
1.	P	**Recommend that a study be made to consider combining cooperatives and regions of cooperation into one multitype library cooperative.**	Library cooperation is based on the premise that libraries can improve services to their primary clientele and/or reduce expenses by working together. While regions of cooperation have been successful in fostering and increasing multitype library cooperation, the possibility of eliminating one level of bureaucracy and combining it with another existing service (public library cooperatives) needs to be considered. Multitype cooperatives could help meet all current needs and foster still stronger interdependency, funding and overall sharing between all types of libraries. Governance for such an organization would need to be changed and carefully constructed to allow adequate representation for all types of libraries. Public libraries would need assurance that existing levels of service would continue, but new

		Recommendation	Narrative
			possibilities would also open between all libraries within the new cooperative. Since the basic geographical area for the regions of cooperation is, for the most part, the same as the public library cooperatives, and since the public library cooperatives are acting as the fiscal agents for the regions of cooperation, and because services offered are similar, the two organizations might be merged, more strongly funded, and the move would be beneficial to promoting interdependency in the state.
1.	S	**Recommend that the regions of cooperation be formalized through legislation so that all types of libraries could have equal access to the state's library resources. Increased funding for the regions of cooperation is also necessary.**	The Regions of Cooperation are the natural mechanism for organizing and funding new multitype library cooperation. The ROCs should be formalized through the state legislature so they could also serve the school and special libraries who currently have limited access to state resource networks. ROCs should also be reorganized so that policies, procedures, and funding priorities are uniform statewide. All special libraries should be encouraged to join a ROC. ROCs should be a regular part of the state funding after the legislative change in status.
1.	SC	**Recommend that provision be made for incentive funding for the development and support of multitype cooperatives, including participation by school library/media centers; this should include a review and restructuring of the regions of cooperation.**	Multitype library communication, cooperation and coordination can be very helpful and advantageous to all types of libraries. School library media centers, in particular, can benefit from this type of synergy. The Regions of Cooperation (ROCs), while helpful in some areas of the state, generally provide uncertain and uneven service to school library media centers and other types of

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			libraries. Their purpose is unclear and organizational relationships are muddled statewide. Regions of Cooperation hold a very real potential for substantive positive impact. It is apparent, however, that thorough review and restructuring of ROCs is necessary before their full contributions to Michigan libraries and their patrons can be realized.
2.	P	**Recommend that minimum standards and guidelines be re-defined for library cooperatives.**	There is significant inequity among library cooperatives in Michigan. The services provided by the cooperatives differ dramatically. While there needs to be flexibility and diversity within each cooperative, it would appear that there is a need to re-examine the role of the cooperatives for consistency, services, and structure. The importance of the cooperatives is not in question, but the manner in which they interpret their purpose may now need to be re-evaluated.
3.	P	**Recommend that legislation be introduced requiring all local units of government to be responsible for providing access to public library service for their residents.**	Public library service throughout the State of Michigan is very spotty. In some counties, there is county-wide library service, while in others there is no service at all. Some residents must travel long distances while others have the convenience of library service nearby. In order to encourage literacy and provide access to information for all of the residents of the state, cities, townships, and villages should be responsible for negotiating whatever is necessary to provide access to public library service for their residents.

		Recommendation	Narrative
4.	P	**Recommend that regional libraries in Michigan be encouraged to reorganize as district libraries.**	Currently there is only one (1) regional library still in existence in the state. Under Michigan law, other types of libraries have become stronger and more desirable in terms of the advantages and support under the law. An incentive to encourage libraries to consider consolidation into district libraries should be established by the Library of Michigan.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

Technology

		Recommendation	Narrative
1.	P	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan develop a communications network to transmit requests quickly and efficiently throughout the state.**	In an age where information has become a top commodity for individuals as well as for business and industry, communication networks become a high priority for libraries in accessing and delivering information. In the interest of serving the residents of the state, the Library of Michigan should undertake to develop and support a communication network which will be a part of every library or cooperative service center, and which will assist in and promote the quick and efficient delivery of information to the residents of Michigan through public libraries.
1.	S	**Recommend establishment of a statewide library network. Financial support will be necessary to enable the "have-nots" to be an integral part of either an electronic mail system or a statewide "fax" system.**	Rapid communication by all of the state's libraries is needed. Provision of a statewide library network could be accomplished by either a relatively cheap electronic mail system, a "fax" system, or some other network system. The present support for "fax" equipment could be extended. Financial support is necessary to enable some of the smaller libraries to become part of a statewide network. The network would provide Michigan's citizens with a more effective and efficient library service.
2.	A	**Recommend development of software that would facilitate cooperative usage of systems, libraries, access to collections, and access to databases.**	Considerable duplication of effort is made by individual libraries and systems in the development of software for in-house use. The state should support and encourage the development of software that could allow diverse systems to communicate (e.g., CLSI with NOTIS via MERIT) providing access to all

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			libraries and collections which have automated or are planning to automate. Also possible is the development of software that would make access to "complicated" databases easier by the client. The Library of Michigan should take a leadership role in this endeavor.
2.	S	**Recommend the provision of guidelines for automating access to all major libraries in Michigan so that user/access/interfaces to the systems are similar.**	Currently, Michigan's libraries are using many different software programs to access their own databases. Effective interface can be provided by establishing guidelines for similar access to these systems so they can be used more easily by all libraries.
2.	SC	**Recommend the utilization of technology to promote access to local and special collections by networking and linkage among all types of libraries.**	Computer technology now permits greater accessibility to collections than ever before. What were once "hidden pockets" of information buried away in collections, can now be accessed through library databases. The Library of Michigan should strongly encourage libraries of all types, perhaps through incentive grants for retrospective conversion, to participate in linking their collections through computer technology. An analysis of each library – school, public, special, and academic – would reveal that every library to some extent has unique holdings. These unique holdings could potentially become part of a statewide network of information resources which will permit the citizens of the State of Michigan to access collections which previously have been unavailable.
3.	P	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan undertake as a top priority, public library access to a statewide database.**	The Library of Michigan should fund a statewide database structured so that the holdings of libraries throughout Michigan could be located quickly and easily. Priority could be given to expand access to

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			the MERIT network, or other statewide database, so that public libraries and cooperatives could actively promote resource sharing. Public libraries frequently lack the necessary funding to move into database access and the mission of the Library of Michigan could give priority to bring the state and its libraries together through such a program which would fund the program and create equal access to all of the residents of the state through all public libraries.
4.	S	**Recommend that all state agency library collections be entered into the NOTIS database.**	A first significant step towards building a statewide database would be the inputting of the various state agency library collections into the Library of Michigan's NOTIS system.
5.	S	**Recommend the provision of adequate numbers of ports for general library access to the Library of Michigan online catalog.**	Any recommendation that suggests additions to the NOTIS database carries with it an implicit need for additional ports into the NOTIS system for access. Agency library and general library "special collection" additions to the database indicate increased need for entry into the system.
6.	A	**Recommend the acquisition of new technological tools to accommodate a more technologically oriented clientele.**	While it is the primary responsibility of the parent institution to increase library funding to support the acquisition of new technological tools, including the purchase of hardware, software and staff training, the Library of Michigan should serve as a resource for information, evaluation of new technology, and establishment of protocols. A coordinating force is needed as the trend to multiplicity of automation networks within the state continues. The Library of Michigan should survey the regions of cooperation to ascertain that each has at least one academic library participating in the OCLC network; and, if not, the

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

		Recommendation	Narrative
			Library of Michigan should determine if monetary support is necessary to assure such OCLC network participation.
6.	S	**Recommend that a new program be initiated to aid the librarians in the state to select and utilize the new technologies in their libraries. Demonstration projects should be provided.**	Technology is rapidly changing the information world, and all libraries will experience dramatic changes in the future. The Library of Michigan should assume an active role in providing the direction that the librarians indicated in their survey returns are needed to select and to utilize these new technologies. The changes are occurring so rapidly that it is nearly impossible for individual librarians to keep current.
7.	S	**Recommend that an equipment laboratory be created to assist practicing librarians in the evaluation and selection of new information technologies. Hardware, software and peripherals could be provided for comparison of various features.**	A centralized location where various equipment and systems could be compared would aid librarians to make decisions for acquiring new technologies. The Library of Michigan should provide the location where hardware, software and peripherals could be provided for comparison of various features.
8.	A	**Recommend that the Library of Michigan work with the state agencies to expand access to the MERIT network or other statewide database to link libraries.**	Public academic institutions have access to the MERIT network which links their respective computer centers, and has the potential of linking the online systems of the state-funded academic institutions. If the five million resources of the private institutions are to be made more easily available, access to such a statewide utility needs to be expanded beyond public institutions.

A=Academic Libraries, **P**=Public Libraries, **S**=Special Libraries, **SC**=School Libraries

Section 6

Academic Libraries Subcommittee Report

Margaret E. Auer, Chair
Christian Holmes
Lee Lebbin
Carolyn McMillen
Joseph Mika
Eleanor Pinkham

Academic Libraries Subcommittee

Report

The charge delivered to the Academic Subcommittee of the Library of Michigan Board of Trustees Task Force on Interdependency/Funding articulated the major responsibilities of the subcommittee to be "to provide an accurate account of academic libraries in Michigan, including their relationship with other types of libraries." The charge enumerated eight areas that were to be addressed:

1) statistical data on academic libraries in Michigan
2) current level of support of academic libraries
3) other states' activities in support of academic libraries
4) level of support needed to appropriately fund academic libraries
5) state aid for academic libraries
6) interdependency between academic libraries and other types of libraries
7) relationship of academic libraries with the Library of Michigan
8) future needs of academic libraries

The first step toward accomplishing this objective was to develop and distribute a survey to all academic libraries in the state which would provide the committee with the necessary background information. In order to make the task of completing the survey as easy as possible for the academic libraries the committee used the Association of College and Research Libraries survey form, incorporating additional questions as needed. In addition, because there was a common set of questions to be asked of all types of libraries by each of the Task Force subcommittees a second questionnaire was distributed.

Sixty-one (61) of one hundred twenty-one (121) libraries, or 50.4%, responded to the Statewide Library Survey with fewer libraries completing the Academic Library Statistics Survey. Although showing the trends of funding, programs and activities occurring within academic libraries, the information generated is far from complete or totally representative of the academic library world in Michigan. The weaknesses in the survey statistical results becomes more apparent with the absence of responses from five of the major public academic libraries, including the largest of the three research libraries. Another weakness in the results is the lack of appropriate interdependency statistics kept by the academic libraries. There is an awareness that the libraries support the general citizenry but, on the whole, the libraries do not take the time to verify the volume of their activities. As Louis Shores wrote "academic libraries have been so careful in the preservation of all other materials only too frequently they have failed to organize and preserve their own library records." As good researchers, therefore, the subcommittee turned to standard reference tools and existing studies to fill in missing data and give direction.

There are more than twenty-five types of academic libraries in Michigan cited in the American Library Directory 40th Edition 1987-88[1]. Of these academic institutions, forty-nine (49) are private, forty-three (43) are public and nineteen (19) institutions have more than one library. Ten (10) are Doctoral, eighteen (18) are graduate, and sixty-four (64) are undergraduate or associate degree granting institutions.

The following list indicates the wide range of resources and distinctive information available in Michigan academic libraries: General undergraduate and graduate collections, Africana, Agricultural, Animal Industries, Art, Art and Maps, Asia, Business Administration, Chemistry, Computer technology, Dentistry, Design, Education film libraries-Media resource center, Fine Arts, Law, Manufacturing engineers, Mathematics, Mental Health Research, Medical, Music and Dance, Physics-Astronomy, Transportation Research, and Urban Affairs.

In addition to the types of academic library collections mentioned above, as well as several others not mentioned, a number of libraries house special collections, rare books, archive, and document depositories. For example, survey responding libraries house special collections such as the Ludwig Von Mises Collection, a History of Books and Printing 1456- , the Moses Coit Tyler Collection of Early American Literature, Hicks Women in Literature Collection, Springer Collection of Lincolniana and Civil War Materials, Institute of Cistercian Studies Collection, Ramsey Collection of Children's Literature, Meeter Calvinism Collection, George Booth Fine Art Folios, etc.

Selected library collections detailed in the Association of College and Research Libraries report, Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1985,[2] held by Michigan academic libraries include the following:

Manuscripts and archives	39,897
Cartographic materials	898,398
Graphic materials (units)	591,590
Audio titles	246,954
Film titles	23,125
Video titles	15,498
Machine readable materials	532,203
Other library materials	486,490

A cumulative collection of over 22 million volumes is housed by 92 Michigan academic institution libraries. Individual holdings range from 1,800 to nearly 6 million. A total of 22,444,351 volumes was cited by the ACRL library statistics report. That study also shows that private academic libraries hold nearly 5 million volumes or 25% of the total number of volumes while public academic libraries account for over 17 million volumes or 75% of the total number.

These figures do not reflect the 278,146 periodical subscriptions received by both public and private academic libraries or the eleven (11) million microforms housed.

Further statistics gathered from the ALA Directory indicate that the sum of the annual academic library budgets exceed seventy-five (75) million dollars, with seventeen (17) million designated for purchase of books and serials. In addition, over $336,000 is spent on audiovisuals, $216,000 on database services, and $69,000 for machine readable materials. The staffing of the academic libraries includes over 560 librarians, 840 support staff, and 1,255 student assistants. Of significant value also, are the hours of service furnished by academic libraries. They range from 80 to 120 hours weekly.

Faculty, administrators, undergraduate students, and graduate students comprise the main clientele of the academic library. The Michigan academic institutions serve approximately 467,500 students and a teaching faculty of 25,130 individuals. Each institution shares its resources with area institutions with whom a reciprocal borrowing agreement has been made. In addition to these main groups, the academic library also serves local public and high school libraries as well as middle school students upon request. Members of area communities are also able to use academic libraries within the guidelines maintained by individual institutions.

The most basic service offered by the academic libraries of Michigan is the circulation of materials. Even at the most elemental level, no less than 22,000,000 items are available for public use. In addition to this massive circulation capability, numerous other services are offered by academic libraries. They include the following: audiovisual materials and viewing sites, interlibrary loan services, bibliographic instruction, database services, and reference service. In addition to these, academic libraries participate in reciprocal lending agreements, maintain a union list of serials, provide meeting rooms and photocopy equipment, and take an active role in multitype networks.

Interlibrary loan statistics furnished by those libraries responding to the Michigan Task Force questionnaire indicated that the state's academic libraries provided 80,926 loans to other libraries while borrowing 47,294 items from other libraries. Follow-up telephone conversations with representatives from the five non-responding libraries mentioned earlier determined that these institutions loaned 23,045 items while borrowing 22,432 items. (Attachment 2) With a total of 69,726 materials borrowed and 103,971 items loaned, the difference of 34,245 (or 60%), clearly shows that more items are provided to than borrowed from other libraries.

A special report prepared by Paul Cappuzzelo, Marketing Representative for OCLC,[3] charts the number of percentage of borrows by Michigan libraries from other Michigan libraries of those libraries using the OCLC interlibrary loan network by type of library. A summary of his work (Attachment 3) shows that of the 55,915 loans within Michigan for 1986-87, academic libraries provide 65% of all interlibrary loans, special libraries provide 27%, and public libraries provide 8%.

In the last ten years the economic and financial pressures on academic libraries have increased significantly. Inflation in prices and costs, and devaluation of the dollar due to long-term changes in economic conditions worldwide have become the most serious pressures. In just the past three years the annual increase in the cost of serial publications has spiraled upwards from about 7% to over 25%. There has been a continuing growth in the number of published documents of all kinds which form the pool of library acquisitions, accompanied of course, by the steady increase in prices. Also evident is the ever growing demands from faculty and students to have access to a wider range of materials in both traditional and newer formats, including electronic databases and software programs. Pressures to adopt new technology are becoming intense, and although often justified in terms of long-term savings and enhanced information provision, the short-term demand on library budgets is great. Library staff have exercised much creativity at doing more with less, but there is a point beyond which dollars cannot be stretched. When that point is reached cuts in collections and programs are unavoidable, diminishing the quality of library services both to the libraries' primary users and to others from throughout the state who need access to the libraries' collections.

Michigan libraries are now well into the microcomputer age and the challenge is to find new ways to support their users. One particular need is the acquisition of new technological tools to accommodate a more technologically oriented clientele and to enhance the libraries' capacity to share information, to participate in the building of national bibliographic databases, to increase their response to interlibrary loan requests, and to participate in statewide special programs, such as preservation and conservation. Because of budgetary reductions and increased costs most libraries will require infusions of new funds. From what source(s) will these necessary funds come? The majority of academic libraries receive funding from the parent institution, with only supplemental help in the form of federal sources, grants and contracts, development and endowment funds and gifts. Only one library receives state funds beyond the library budget provided by the parent institution. As the funding levels have eroded, libraries have reallocated funds within their budgets and they have initiated user fees for such services as database searches and interlibrary loans. In the content of inflation, declining funding levels for libraries, technology, public policy and library usage, the important question is who should pay?

It is impossible to specifically state what levels of support are required to fund Michigan's academic libraries. The missions of these libraries may be quite similar, but their roles do differ depending on their institutional environments, as well as their users' needs and demands. Academic administrators and faculty need to understand the present and potential role of libraries and their need for additional funding via the annual budget allocation. Since academic libraries are essential to the structure of the interdependency of information providers throughout the state, it is imperative that legislators understand the role and needs of these libraries.

Areas in which support levels should be initiated or increased are those which relate to statewide multitype services and programs. Examples of services are Interlibrary Loan, Database Searching, and Union Listing of Serials. Funding should be provided to cover a mutually-agreed upon fee to support lending libraries. Procedures developed for reporting must be efficient and cost-effective. All libraries should have access to the OCLC database for purposes of identification and location of the library holding a needed item. Funding should be provided to improve access to information databases throughout the state. Support would be in the form of funding for the hardware, software, and training. The question of user fees for the searches is a philosophical one and cannot be answered here.

The building of the statewide union list of serials database through the OCLC utility has been underway since the early 1980's. The development of this database has been instrumental in spreading the interlibrary loan burden more widely among academic institutions. There are numerous libraries which have not participated in this project due to the start up and annual storage costs. Union listing of all libraries' serial holdings into the statewide database should be a high priority objective for this state. Funding of start up costs and the absorbing of the annual storage fees to maintain the information in the database should be made available.

Special programs which are deemed important to resource sharing must be mutually agreed upon by the appropriate groups and should be coordinated by the Library of Michigan. Any program which enhances and enlarges the national databases (such as OCLC and RLIN) and thus enhances the states access to information, such as retrospective conversion, should be considered. Any program which serves to preserve the collections in Michigan libraries should be considered. Unique and special collections which have been cataloged should be converted to machine readable form and added to a common database such as OCLC. Depending upon the fullness of cataloging, the price might average around $5.00 per title (estimated OCLC cost). The first standard to be applied would be the uniqueness of the collection; second would be the cataloging standards; the final product would reflect the MARC format standards.

In the current excitement and enthusiasm for the new technologies, the existence of older, valuable research sources are sometimes overlooked. Michigan libraries have been carefully building their collections for many years, and included are works which are now irreplaceable.

Since it is not economically possible for most libraries to establish and maintain preservation facilities, a cooperative statewide effort should be made and funding should be provided by the state. Although a centralized preservation and conservation unit should be the long-term goal, much could be done in the short-term. Here, again, the effort would require careful preparation and coordination. Standards would have to be applied in determining which titles should be preserved. Librarians would have to determine if the title was worthy of preservation – is it unique and irreplaceable? Is it of research and/or historical value? If the answers are yes, then determination of whether it is brittle and in a precarious condition must be made. Decisions as to the best manner of preserving must also be made – binding, preservation microfilming, or full conservation treatment. The latter method is very labor intensive and requires experience and expertise. An initial statewide program could be limited to the first two methods, and there are facilities in Michigan which could be used. There are standards for binding, the Library Binding Institute Standards and the Library of Congress standards for preservation microfilming. Other standards to be considered would be ARL "Draft Statement on Unlimited Use and Exchange of Bibliographic Data." As in all such proposed programs, costs cannot be determined until information is available on numbers of items to be handled. It is also essential to note that in such programs members of a library staff are always involved and their time and expertise should not be considered as a completely free item in the program's budget.

Academic libraries provide information resources and access to the information first to its primary clientele – the faculty and students of the institutions. They are, however, actively engaged in cooperative database building and in sharing resources with others throughout the state. They are active partners in the dissemination of information and information resources and that participation in statewide programs of cooperative access and sharing should receive state support.

As attested to in the survey responses, with 90% (49 Yes, 5 No) responding positively to the need for more sharing, academic librarians recognize that sharing both makes sense and is a fiscal necessity. While academic librarians are committed to resource sharing they also have a deep concern over the ability of participants, both lenders and borrowers of all types, to be able to fund the system as it is currently operating and the development that is needed. Of particular concern is 1) the funding for net interlibrary loan transactions, 2) direct services to patrons not associated with the college or university (from as small as 1% to as much as 20% of all circulation; from 1% to 82% of interlibrary loan, with a 19% average; and, from 2% to 27% of database searches), and 3) purchase and operating costs for the computer technology and telecommunications necessary to continue and upgrade resource sharing activities.

In academic libraries within the state of Michigan interdependency and resource sharing is very much alive and occurring in a variety of ways. For example the cooperative efforts include:

1) sharing of documents, through interlibrary loans to other libraries and directly to walk-in patrons, both between academic libraries and also with non-collegiate users
2) sharing of information/reference services and expertise
3) production and maintenance of union lists of resources
4) shared automated cataloging and circulation operations and activities
5) staff development and workshops
6) collection development
7) bibliographic instruction
8) audio-visual services
9) database searching
10) services of off-campus users.

While the interdependence reaches its greatest sophistication when it occurs in local/regional arrangements, 86% of the responding libraries are members of Regions of Cooperation, or with libraries of common specialty interests, such as legal or medical services, resource sharing is also taking place in situations where the only thing the two libraries have in common is that a patron who needs a service is matched with a library that can provide the service requested.

Review of the academic libraries' activities in ten other states shows examples where cooperative efforts have been successful and where Michigan is relative to others. Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, and Illinois have adopted guidelines which permit valid library users at any one academic institution to check out materials at another academic institution. Pennsylvania has a statewide Library Card System. Connecticut and Illinois have multitype automated circulation networks. There are a cooperative buying program, statewide delivery system, conservation and preservation and telefacsimile networks, continuing education, reference referral, and legislative assistance programs in the various states. As far as funding of projects is concerned, budgets from the parent institutions, foundations, grants, state funds, and LSCA monies are used to support the projects. For example, a $100,000 challenge grant was given to purchase the central hardware for the multitype automated circulation system in Connecticut; the University of California received LSCA funds for the development of a prototype pocket radio network and talking terminals for visually impaired individuals; LSCA funds were given to the state's library association to develop a program to recruit new librarians; the state of Illinois funds the ILLINET/OCLC statewide online catalog and the installation of the telefacsimile network. In their respective states California and Illinois used LSCA funds for automation and interlibrary loan/automation programs. The network of academic libraries in the state of Michigan is working well in both formal and informal arrangements to meet the information needs of Michigan. Students, whether in college, K-12, or ISD, along with citizens whose interest is professional or personal, all are benefiting from this interdependent system. With greater funding college libraries can improve this system of service to Michigan's students, scholars and citizens. Along with funding, a need for statewide leadership in a more coordinated effort of resource sharing was cited by several respondents in the survey.

It is recognized that the statutory responsibility of the Library of Michigan is primarily toward the legislative branch of state government and cooperative efforts of the public libraries. It is also a fact however that there is an implied relationship between the Library of Michigan and the academic library community.

By law (The Library of Michigan Act, Act 540 of 1982, Section 4), the Library of Michigan Board of Trustees, which has one Academic Librarian representative appointed by the Governor, prepares the state library budget proposals for the Legislative Council and recommends to the Legislative Council:

"(a) The services the library shall provide.

(b) The manner in which the services shall be provided.

(c) Other matters of general policy concerning the library."[4]

The duties of the Library of Michigan are articulated in Section 10 of the Act. It is part (3) which indicates that "The library also shall:" wherein academic libraries see themselves as fitting appropriately. Part (3) includes statements:

> "(g) **Encourage** contractual and cooperative arrangements between and among all kinds of libraries for the improvement of library services to the people of this state.
>
> (h) Coordinate the library's library services with the library services of all kinds of libraries.
>
> (i) Collect, preserve, and publish appropriate statistics on all kinds of libraries in the state.
>
> (j) conduct research and publish the results for the benefit of all kinds of libraries and the library services to the people of the state."[5]

Webster's Third New International Dictionary lists as definition number three of ENCOURAGE as: "to give help or patronage to: foster <government grants designed to encourage conservation>."[6]

Whereas, the Library of Michigan has in its operation fostered public libraries and the major public research academic libraries, there is no legal reason for this narrow interpretation of the word "libraries". The word "libraries" includes all academic libraries, be they publicly or privately supported.

With the above understanding of the word encouragement and the word libraries to encompass all academic libraries, the current legislation as articulated is sufficient mandate for the Library of Michigan to seriously consider the proposed services recommended later in this document. Moreover, the legislation provides a clear challenge for academic libraries to develop a plan for cooperation and present it through the Academic Librarian Representative, to the Board of Trustees for their consideration and recommendation to the Legislative Council for approval and "encouragement".

Some services and/or programs that should be provided by the Library of Michigan include leadership in statewide automated networking, subsidizing of the interlibrary loan system, development of reference sources in the local libraries, and evaluation of the Regions of Cooperation role in multitype cooperation.

The involvement of academic libraries in the ROCs is voluntary. There are academic libraries that do not participate, and there are many that are actively involved, including holding positions on the ROCs governing board. Some of the academic libraries contribute as: 1) regional outlets, 2) union listing agents, and 3) telefacsimile transmission centers. Many of these libraries have received LSCA funds for providing services or for the acquisition of equipment. The academic libraries benefit in some of the ROCs in the areas of interlibrary loan, union listing, discounts by cooperative purchasing, van delivery of documents, automation, and database access.

It is evident from academic library responses that the role of the ROCs must be clarified in terms of short and long range goals of library development and cooperation within the state. More definitive guidelines and policies need to be implemented to guarantee that the ROCs are truly multitype in nature. And, because of the changing criteria of evaluation on the type of projects for which LSCA Title III funds can be used, a plan for state funding should be developed if the ROCs are to be the mechanism for library cooperation and networking in Michigan.

The previous pages provide an overview of the interdependency/networking activities and funding of survey responding academic libraries in Michigan. It is recognized that each institution's mission statement must be supported by its library, and

> Whereas the library was once thought of as a collection of books, it now appears that the central purpose of the contemporary academic library must be to provide its users with access to information.[7]
>
> This conceptual expansion of the library's objective has serious implications... First of all, the quality and nature of services provided for information access are at least as significant as the size of a particular collection. Secondly, attention is diverted from traditional information containers, e.g., books and journals, to formats made possible by the new technology. The librarian's task now includes not only providing access to the library's own collection, but also achieving fast, reliable access in convenient, readable form to information residing in other, perhaps distant, collections. Academic librarians must manage access to the growing body of knowledge and maximize its usefulness for students and researchers.[8]

It is the academic library's responsibility to service its primary clientele, registered students and faculty, first. However, academic libraries house a wealth of information and numbers of volumes not available at other libraries or within other communities. It is acknowledged that there is also a recognized responsibility for academic libraries to make these resources available for those outside the institution.

The emergence of electronic technology clearly serves to answer the academic community's intensified demands on information access. It is also this technology which makes resource sharing information more readily available among types of libraries.

As academic institutions, both private and public, struggle with the demands of inflation, stabilizing student enrollment, and increased competition for external funding, the libraries experience the financial pressures of the parent institution. Yet, at the same time, there is still the expectation that the libraries will have more and better resources, services, and technology.

The recommendations which appear throughout the report show that many academic libraries are themselves in need of help. It is apparent that most academic libraries are willing to share, but there is the reality of their budgets.

Within the report's data analysis there are also numerous recommendations for strengthening the role of the Library of Michigan within the academic and general library community. The recommendations are being provided in the form of an executive summary. However, in order to have a true sense of the academic library's role in interdependency, it will be necessary to spend some time reading the complete report.

Footnotes

[1] American Library Directory, 40th Edition 1987-88. (New York: R.W. Bowker Company, 1987).

[2] Association of College and Research Libraries, Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1985: National Summaries, State Summaries, Institutional Tables. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1987).

[3] Paul Cappuzzelo, Marketing Representative, Resource Sharing, Marketing and User Service Division of OCLC, Special Report (October 3, 1987).

[4] Legislative Service Bureau, Michigan State Laws Relating to Michigan Libraries. Reprint from Michigan Compiled Laws, 1984, p. 56.

[5] Ibid., p. 58.

[6] Webster's Third International Dictionary of the English Language. Unabridged. G.&C. Meriam Co., 1981. p. 747.

[7] Gordon R. Williams, "The Function and Methods of Libraries in the Diffusion of Knowledge," in The Role of Libraries in the Growth of Knowledge, ed. Don R. Swanson (Chicago: University of Chicago Pr., 1980), p. 58-75.

[8] Lawson Crowe and Susan H. Anthes, "The Academic Librarian and Information Technology: Ethical Issues." College & Research Libraries, 49:123-130 (Mr 88).

Attachment 1

Academic Institutions Surveyed	Surveys Returned	
	Statewide	Academic
Adrian College		
Albion College	x	x
Alma College	x	x
Alpena Community College	x	x
Andrews University	x	x
Aquinas College	x	x
Baker College		
Bay De Noc Community College		
Calvin College & Seminary	x	x
Carnegie Institute of Troy		
Center for Creative Studies	x	x
Central Michigan University		
Cleary College		
Cleary College/Livingston Branch	x	
Concordia College		
Cooley Law School	x	x
Cranbrook Academy of Art	x	x
Davenport College of Business/Kalamazoo		
Davenport College of Business/Lansing		
Delta College		
Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary		
Detroit College of Business	x	x
Detroit College of Business/Flint		
Detroit College of Law	x	x
Detroit Institute of Commerce		
Duns Scotus Seminary		
Eastern Michigan University		
Ferris State College		
Glen Oaks Community College		
GMI Engineering/Management Institute		
Gogebic Community College		
Grace Bible College		
Grand Rapids Baptist College	x	x
Grand Rapids Junior College		
Grand Valley State University	x	x
Great Lakes Bible College	x	
Great Lakes Jr. College of Business		
Henry Ford Community College	x	x
Highland Park Community College		
Hillsdale College	x	x
Hope College		

Jackson Business Institute		
Jackson Community College		
Jordan College	x	x
Jordan College Energy Institute	x	
Kalamazoo College	x	x
Kalamazoo Valley Community College		
Kellogg Community College	x	x
Kendall College of Art and Design		
Kirtland Community College	x	x
Lake Michigan College	x	
Lake Superior State College		
Lansing Community College		
Lawrence Institute of Technology	x	x
Lewis College of Business		
Macomb Community College/Center	x	x
Macomb Community College/South	x	x
Madonna College		
Marygrove College		
Mercy College of Detroit	x	x
Michigan Christian College		
Michigan State University	x	x
Michigan Technological University	x	x
Mid-Michigan Community College		
Midrasha College of Jewish Studies		
Midwestern Baptist College		
Monroe County Community College		
Montcalm Community College	x	x
Mott Community College	x	x
Muskegon Business College		
Muskegon Community College	x	x
Nazareth College	x	x
North Central Michigan College	x	x
Northern Michigan University	x	x
Northwestern Michigan College	x	x
Northwood Institute	x	x
Oakland Community C/Auburn Hills		
Oakland Community C/Highland Lakes	x	x
Oakland Community C/Orchard Ridge		
Oakland Community C/SE Campus System		
Oakland University	x	x
Olivet College		
Reformed Bible College		
Sacred Heart Seminary College	x	x
Saginaw Valley State University	x	x
St. Clair County Community College	x	x
St. John's Seminary Library	x	x
St. Mary's College		
Schoolcraft College		
Siena Heights College	x	x

Southwestern Michigan College		
Spring Arbor College	x	x
Suomi College	x	x
Suomi College/Fin-Amer Hist Arch	x	x
University of Detroit/Clarkston	x	x
University of Detroit/Dentistry	x	x
University of Detroit/E Bus & Admin.	x	x
University of Detroit/Main	x	x
University of Michigan		
University of Michigan/B and Admin	x	x
University of Michigan/Clements Lib		
University of Michigan/Dearborn	x	x
University of Michigan/Inst Soc Res		
University of Michigan/Law	x	x
Univ of Mich/Mental Health Res Inst	x	x
University of Michigan/MI Hist Coll.		
University of Michigan/Transportation	x	x
Walsh College	x	x
Washtenaw Community College	x	x
Wayne County Community College		
Wayne State University (all libraries)	x	
Wayne State University/Law		
Wayne State University/Purdy		
Wayne State University/Kresge		
Wayne State University/Science		
Wayne State University/Medical		
West Shore Community College		
Western Michigan University	x	x
Western Theological Seminary		
William Tyndale College		

Total Number Surveyed: 121

Total Survey Responses:		
	53	Academic
	3	Law (Academic)
	2	Medical (Academic)
	3	Other

Other Included:

Special, in that our collection is highly focused in the area of renewable energy (Jordan College Energy Institute)

Ethnic archives (Suomi College Finish-American Historical Archives)

Research — attached to academic institution (UM/Transportation)

Attachment 2

Interlibrary Loan Statistics
Telephone Conversations

Institution	**Borrowed**	**Loaned**
Central Michigan	12,382	7,127
Eastern Michigan	465	1,250
Ferris State	1,728	2,328
Lake Superior	809	1,119
University of Michigan	7,048	11,221
Total	22,432	23,045
Percentage	49.3%	50.7%
Total Interlibrary Loans All Institutions	173,697	
Items Borrowed All Institutions	69,726	40%
Items Loaned All Institutions	103,971	60%

Attachment 3

Number of ILL Borrows Received by Michigan Libraries (Row) From Other Michigan Libraries (Column) FY 1986/87

Frequency Row Pct	Acad Res	Academic	Public	Special	Total
Acad Res	0 0.00	1038 48.94	154 7.26	929 43.80	2121
Academic	1453 5.29	18637 67.90	1742 6.35	5617 20.46	27449
Public	59 3.69	828 51.81	188 11.76	523 32.73	1598
Special	1976 7.98	12497 50.50	2438 9.85	7836 31.66	24747
Total	3488	33000	4522	14905	55915

Type of Borrower	Frequency	Percent
Acad Res	3375	9.6%
Academic	12935	36.7%
Public	1052	3.0%
Special	17848	50.7%
Total	35210	100.0%

Academic Libraries Subcommittee

Summary of Recommendations

1. **Recommend that the State of Michigan provide direct financial support to academic libraries which participate in programs of cooperative access and resource sharing to patrons who are not part of their primary clientele, that is, registered students, and faculty and staff of the institution.**

   Academic libraries receive funding from the parent institution to service their faculties and students. Services to others are essentially being underwritten by the institution. Academic libraries which are net lenders through interlibrary loan, which service walk-in patrons not associated with the academic institution, or which participate in other resource sharing activities should have the costs of those extra services compensated by the State of Michigan. State funding of telecommunications costs associated with resource sharing, such as accessing state or national networks (e.g., OCLC, RLIN, WLN), or the use of telefacsimile equipment are additional examples of how state government can provide much needed assistance. 1987-88 OCLC telecommunication costs for libraries in Michigan is $225,250. An anticipated 6% increase each year for the next two years will increase the amount paid to $251,481. The statewide effort of resource sharing needs additional planning, coordinating and documentation. The Library of Michigan is in the best position to organize this effort in a manner not burdened with unnecessary paperwork. Likewise, the Library of Michigan should administer the funding for reimbursing academic libraries for services they provide the citizens of the State of Michigan.

2. **Recommend that union listing of all libraries' serial holdings into a statewide online database be a high priority goal for the state. The Library of Michigan should develop a mechanism for funding start-up costs and, more importantly, request funds from the State of Michigan to cover the annual storage fees for maintenance of the information in the database.**

   The building of the statewide union list of serials database through the OCLC national bibliographic utility has been underway since the early 1980's. The building of the database has enhanced the statewide sharing of resources particularly through interlibrary loan programs. In order to increase Michigan libraries' capacity to participate in resource sharing, serial union listings must be maintained and enhanced in the future. Annual storage fees are currently approximately $10,651 for all libraries, however, an anticipated fifty percent increase in the next year will raise the cost to $15,977.

3. **Recommend the development of a state-supported, statewide library card system for use in all libraries.**

Access Pennsylvania, a statewide card first implemented in 1985 in the state of Pennsylvania, has received excellent press coverage and reviews. A universal card, state-supported, printed by the state, that allows on-site borrowing would encourage and facilitate usage by our clients, the citizens of Michigan. Participating libraries would receive funding based on their participation, circulation of materials by clients who are "non-local library patrons", interlibrary loan processing, and interlibrary loans filled. Study of the Pennsylvania plan is recommended. The coordinator of this program and the facilitator for acquiring state funding should be the Library of Michigan.

4. **Recommend development of a planned use of Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Title III funds.**

As the Library of Michigan completes its first federal audit of LSCA Title III funding and programs, it should develop a plan with region participation for how future funding will be made available for multi-type activities. Will the LSCA Title III funds be reserved for the ROCs? Will monies be made available to other groups (such as a grouping of academic libraries) whose program ideas serve multitype resource sharing? What will happen to the regional structure if LSCA funds are discontinued? All libraries need to know the plan in order to effectively participate.

5. **Recommend the Library of Michigan provide the service of annually gathering appropriate statistics from the academic libraries in Michigan.**

The Library of Michigan should work with academic libraries to develop an effective instrument for the gathering of statistics within the academic community. Then, the Library of Michigan should gather, compile, and publish such information on an annual basis.

6. **Recommend development of reference sources in the local library (particularly CD-ROM) and coordinated implementation of reference services at the regional and state level.**

The Library of Michigan should set up test sites or model installations as an experimental program to determine the economics and cost effectiveness of a CD-ROM program in an academic library setting. The test-site would also be funded to provide demonstrations to other institutions and answer questions relating to the CD-ROM products: frequency of use, hardware available, reliability, etc. If there are positive cost-effective results from the test sites, the Library of Michigan should coordinate the initiation of at least one site in each region of cooperation.

7. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan work with the state agencies to expand access to the MERIT network or other statewide database to link libraries.**

Public academic institutions have access to the MERIT network which links their respective computer centers, and has the potential of linking the online systems of the state-funded academic institutions. If the five million resources of the private institutions are to be made more easily available, access to such a statewide utility needs to be expanded beyond public institutions.

8. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan coordinate a statewide program for the purpose of preserving valuable research and information materials located in Michigan libraries.**

Since it is not economically feasible for most libraries to establish and maintain preservation facilities, a cooperative statewide effort should be made, and funding should be provided by the State of Michigan. The long-term goal should be the establishment and maintenance of a centralized preservation and conservation facility. The short-term goal should be to secure funding to preserve, by binding or preservation microfilming, those information and research materials selected as worthy of preservation. In order for Michigan to be in the forefront in this area, a Task Force on Preservation should be created to put preservation activities into motion.

9. **Recommend the evaluation of the regions of cooperation in regards to the role they have played, are performing, and should take in multitype cooperation.**

The Library of Michigan should develop more definitive guidelines for the regions of cooperation. If they are to be the means for multitype library development within the state, the regions of cooperation need to be structured to assure that they are multitype in organization and operation. Additionally, the Library of Michigan should determine an on-going base of support (state funding) for the regions of cooperation if they are to perform the function of multitype library development. A clear articulation of the role of the regions of cooperation by the Library of Michigan is a needed and necessary first step.

10. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan initiate an internship program and provide financial assistance to develop individuals for professional positions.**

There are a significant number of professional positions which are difficult to fill and for which qualified applicants cannot be found. The state should assist in a program that would provide encouragement to libraries to identify individuals from within their libraries for enrollment in library school. Providing inducements for libraries to send staff members to library school, and providing financial assistance through scholarships and paid internship positions, would allow the library to "home-grow" individuals for current positions, for future vacancies, and for long-range planning. Up-state and rural libraries, which have the most difficult time in recruiting professionals, would benefit through a policy which requires a specified period of employment in a library following the completion of studies.

11. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan coordinate a statewide program for the purpose of identifying and converting to machine readable form special and unique cataloged collections.**

Throughout the state there are special and unique collections which have been cataloged locally which generally provide local access only. To enhance resource sharing by providing increased bibliographic access to these valuable collections, the existing cataloging records should be converted to machine readable form and the data added to a common database such as OCLC. The Library of Michigan should petition for special funding to accomplish this recommendation.

12. **Recommend the acquisition of new technological tools to accommodate a more technologically oriented clientele.**

    While it is the primary responsibility of the parent institution to increase library funding to support the acquisition of new technological tools, including the purchase of hardware, software and staff training, the Library of Michigan should serve as a resource for information, evaluation of new technology, and establishment of protocols. A coordinating force is needed as the trend to multiplicity of automation networks within the state continues. The Library of Michigan should survey the regions of cooperation to ascertain that each has at least one academic library participating in the OCLC network; and, if not, the Library of Michigan should determine if monetary support is necessary to assure such OCLC network participation.

13. **Recommend funding be provided to improve access to information databases throughout the state.**

    It is the primary responsibility of the parent institution to increase its academic library funding to support the purchase of hardware, software, and staff training when developing database services. However, in regions where these services are greatly lacking, the Library of Michigan could support the start-up funding with the use of LSCA funds. An on-going program of information and evaluation of various databases would be helpful to the academic community in determining which to subscribe to or access. Likewise, the Library of Michigan should work with other groups to assure that all areas of the state have economical telecommunications access to database locations.

14. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan coordinate grant proposal writing for groups of libraries.**

    Smaller academic libraries have neither the staff nor the expertise required to develop appropriate grant proposals. The Library of Michigan should facilitate the preparation of proposals when the awarding of the desired funds would enhance resource access, resource sharing, or improved services for the public.

15. **Recommend development of software that would facilitate cooperative usage of systems, libraries, access to collections, and access to databases.**

    Considerable duplication of effort is made by individual libraries and systems in the development of software for in-house use. The state should support and encourage the development of software that could allow diverse systems to communicate (e.g., CLSI with NOTIS via MERIT) providing access to all libraries and collections which have automated or are planning to automate. Also possible is the development of software that would make access to "complicated" databases easier by the client. The Library of Michigan should take a leadership role in this endeavor.

Section 7

Public Libraries Subcommittee Report

David Leamon, Chair
Gloria Coles
Jean Curtis
Leo Dinnan
Sue Hill
Theodore Keffer
Susan Williams
Patricia Olsen Wilson

Public Libraries Subcommittee

Report

Introduction

The most common and at the same time probably the most unique among "types" of libraries in the State of Michigan are public libraries. They are the most common because they are in the majority of communities; they are the most visible to the public at large; they are the most frequently taken for granted as a part of Americana. Public libraries are the most unique because they cross all of the boundaries of age, ethnic, social and economic levels. They serve individuals and groups, and they attempt to serve the general and special interests of the public. Public libraries open their doors to the residents of the state to allow access to millions of books and information resources that are housed within. They network to serve all of the people, including students and faculty, legal and medical workers, as well as the literate and illiterate clients who come to public libraries seeking help and information. It is with this unique, yet common, identity that the Public Libraries Subcommittee of the Library of Michigan Board of Trustees Task Force on Interdependency and Funding met to address its charge.

The Public Libraries Subcommittee realized that much was already known about public libraries in the State of Michigan through the careful gathering and reporting of statistics submitted to the Library of Michigan annually. The charge, then, was to look at the perceived future needs for public libraries in Michigan through the specific areas of Funding, Cooperation, Interdependency, Standards, and the Role of the Library of Michigan as it relates to public libraries specifically. As with the other subcommittees, the Public Libraries Subcommittee issued a statewide Survey for Public Libraries intended to verify current needs and address future needs at the same time. This task was particularly difficult, as there are six class sizes of public libraries in the State of Michigan, comprising 378 individual public libraries. In order to fully understand the statistics and findings of the Subcommittee, it is important to have some background information pertinent to the historical development of public libraries in Michigan.

Public Library History

There were two documents adopted nationally in 1787 – the Federal Constitution which is essentially silent on the matter of education, leaving it to the states, and the Northwest Ordinance which makes a ringing endorsement of governmental responsibility in this area by stating:

> "Article III. Religion, morality and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Throughout the 19th Century as state after state was carved out of the Northwest Territory, the national government insisted that they provide in their constitutions for the support of education, going so far as to mandate that proceeds from the sale of Section 16 of every township go to the support of schools.

Michigan's Constitution of 1835, Article X, Section 4, said:

> "As soon as the circumstances of the state will permit, the legislature shall provide for the establishment of libraries; one at least (in) each township; and the money which shall be paid by persons as an equivalent for exemption from military duty, and the clear proceeds of fines assessed in the several counties for any breach of the penal laws; shall be exclusively applied for the support of said libraries."

Several laws date from this era including one in 1846 allowing for the formation of private association type library companies based on colonial models. These were still popular well into the 19th century all over the country.

In 1876, the U.S. Office of Education published a centennial record entitled, "Public Libraries in the United States." This publication included many kinds of libraries we don't usually call public such as schools, academic, and special purpose libraries. Their grand total on that basis was 94 libraries in Michigan with 212,140 volumes. A more restrictive definition of public library accounted for only 13 of which 6 were township libraries, a far cry from the ideal expressed by the constitution. Even if the 25 society libraries are added as more limited public libraries (mostly on a subscription basis), the number was well below one per township and they tended to cluster in population centers anyway. A number of them were ladies' associations or literary association libraries, a category regularly showing up as seeds of free public libraries allowed for in the 1895 law.

The major law for the establishment of public libraries (Act 164 of 1877), has been amended innumerable times but still provides the framework for city, township, or village public libraries. In 1895, fourth class cities (population under 10,000) were authorized to support a public library either directly or through an existing association library within the city. In 1899 all free public libraries were required to make annual reports to the state and to abide by state rules. In 1909 home rule cities were authorized to acquire property and buildings for a variety of municipal improvements including libraries.

The Constitution of 1908, continued both the mandate of a library in each township and the exclusive use of penal fines for support. At Article XI, Section 14, it read:

> "The legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of at least one library in each township and city; and all fines assessed and collected in the several counties, cities and townships for any breach of penal laws shall be exclusively applied to the support of such libraries."

Several laws originated in this era which emphasized in a general way, the movement toward larger units of service. The County Library Act of 1917 permitted counties to establish and tax for public libraries. In 1925 townships, cities and villages were authorized to provide tax support up to .5 mill for the support of a privately owned library providing free public library services at least three days a week. In 1927, township libraries in adjoining townships were authorized to consolidate if approved by either respective township boards or by referendum. Once consolidated the new library could convert to a free public library under P.A. 164 of 1877. In 1931, regional libraries consisting of two or more counties under the aegis of the State Board were authorized. One such library currently exists. This option never proved popular. In 1952 an extremely flexible law allowed public libraries and local governmental units in almost any combination to join by contract to provide the widest public use of books and avoid unnecessary duplication and expense. The final move came with the passage of the District Library Act in 1955.

Michigan's foundations for public libraries were securely in place by 1960 in spite of considerable confusion over the distribution of penal fines.

The current 1963 Constitution attempted to clarify intent by removing reference to a library in each township or city and by declaring provision for support to be a legislative responsibility. Article VIII, Section 9 reads:

> "The legislature shall provide by law for the establishment and support of public libraries which shall be available to all residents of the state under regulations adopted by the governing bodies thereof. All fines assessed and collected in the several counties, townships and cities for any breach of the penal laws shall be exclusively applied to the support of such public libraries, and county law libraries as provided by law."

In reviewing legislation since 1963, one has to deal only with highlights. 1964 saw one of the most influential pieces of library legislation ever enacted in Michigan, the Penal Fines Act which implemented the new constitutional language and provided an instrumentality to bring about the kind of contracting which very nearly makes a reality of the boast made when this act was signed into law, "With one stroke of the pen, the Governor has extended library service to every citizen of Michigan." One year later Act 286 of 1965 established the foundation for state supported systems of libraries repealed and strengthened by P.A. 89 of 1977 which along with the Penal Fine Act has done much to extend quality library services to Michigan citizens. Two high level acts provided for the superstructure, namely the 1972 Library Network Act defining the research library structure to be coordinated by the State Library and the Library of Michigan Act bringing the State Library into the Legislative Branch and altering its governance to give it more freedom to meet its statutory responsibilities.

Eight Types of Public Libraries

In order to understand the 378 local public libraries, one must understand local government and it is at this point that many of the problems in library planning have arisen. The following brief review may help:

1. The primary political division of the state is the County. There are 83 counties in Michigan. There are no overlapping areas and no uncovered

areas. Thirty-two of Michigan's 83 counties (39%) have County libraries or a combination of counties into a region.

2. The primary political division of counties is the Township, subject to elimination through incorporations so that Townships no longer represent complete coverage of the state as they did in 1835 when the Constitution designated them as primary units for library services. There are 108 Township libraries in the State.

3. Villages are subdivisions of Townships based on local choice which allows for variable boundaries overlapping townships and even counties. There are 19 village libraries in the State.

4. Cities are not subdivisions of any other governmental unit except the State. They are incorporated by local action either under the general government laws of the State or under home rule charters. Their territory may cross county lines and their governing patterns vary considerably. There are 118 city libraries in the State, the most numerous form.

5. District libraries may be formed by any combination of two or more municipalities defined as cities, villages, school districts, townships, and counties. There are 64 district libraries in the State.

6. Private associations may under certain conditions operate public libraries and be supported out of public funds not to exceed 1/2 mill.

7. School districts like counties are permanent subdivisions of the state which do not overlap and which cover the whole State. Since New York experimented with a statewide organization by school district in 1837 (note that this was two years after Michigan's designation of townships) many midwestern states have encouraged school district public libraries. There are 32 school district public libraries in the State. The local governmental boundary crossings by school districts are the rule rather than the exception, so they present most of the problems of double taxation.

8. Regional libraries, as an option for creating a public library system, are primarily a thing of the past. Currently there is only one Regional Library System in Michigan. District libraries have since been established and could possibly be considered as a replacement option for the Regional library systems.

9. Cooperatives are relatively new units in Michigan, having been sponsored as a solution to library problems in keeping with professional emphasis on larger units of service. P.A. 286 of 1965 provided alternative methods of organizing systems and was replaced by P.A. 89 of 1977 more closely controlling the state structured and state supported regionalized service centers. There are 16 cooperatives in the State.

10. Regions of Cooperation have been formed since 1980, to serve 15 regions providing voluntary participation by public, academic, school, special and other types of libraries for the purpose of facilitating more effective resource sharing. Support for these regions comes primarily for LSCA funding, and the boundaries for the regions are patterned after those established for Public Library Cooperatives.

The historical perspective and overview of the eight types of public libraries and how they came to be in the state emphasize the fact that unlike other "types" of libraries, public libraries have evolved and grown under a variety of public acts and provisions which have benefitted the public, but at the same time confused government as it attempts to deal with support, laws of governance for each of the individual types of libraries and further development of strong public library service programs statewide. The diversity of types is good, as it allows local governing bodies to decide which would be best for their community, and their resources. Such diversity, however, requires that the Library of Michigan be constantly aware of possible changes in the legal provisions which may reflect negatively on one type of public library or the other as the laws are considered for change and revision.

Public Libraries and the Role of the Library of Michigan

What has been lacking for public libraries throughout their existence in Michigan is incentive. They are serving all of the people, but they have little in the way of actual support incentive to grow, improve or prosper. To a degree, smaller public libraries rely heavily upon the larger ones. The larger Class VI libraries often find added costs for them to serve (network) with other libraries, especially those lacking collection size and depth, or collection specialties which would justify reciprocal lending. P.A. 89 has been the primary support for networking and cooperating, but it is not adequate for the increasing demands being placed on public libraries. It would seem that since the Library of Michigan has extensive responsibility through P.A. 89 in regulating public libraries that the public libraries would have precedence in the area of financial support and financial incentive programs. However, as the laws of the state have defined the Role of the Library of Michigan, they seem also to have assigned responsibility for "types" of libraries and requirements for state aid, but they do not allow for strong incentives needed to encourage public libraries to improve, grow, and actively work for interdependency.

The Role of the Library of Michigan, as shown under public acts listed, seems to give only a superficial overseer participation in relation to all types of libraries. *Encourage, *Coordinate, *Certify, *Adjudicate, and *Promulgate are the strongest directives.

Library of Michigan Act, P.A. 540 of 1982 as amended, gives the Library of Michigan a very broad charge in relation to all types of libraries including public libraries as shown by excerpts from Sec. 10(3).

"(f) Further, by all appropriate means, the development of effective, statewide school library services.

*(g) Encourage contractual and cooperative arrangements between and among all kinds of libraries for the improvement of library services to the people of this state.

*(h) Coordinate the library's library services with the library services of all kinds of libraries.

(i) Collect, preserve, and publish appropriate statistics on all kinds of libraries in the state.

(j) Conduct research and publish the results for the benefit of all kinds of libraries and the library services to the people of the state.

(k) Provide all services which the state library was authorized to provide immediately preceding the effective date of this act.

(l) Under the authority granted by law, promote and advance library science in this state."

Other statutes deal more specifically with certain aspects of the Library of Michigan's responsibility including:

The Penal Fine Act, P.A. 59 of 1964, requires the Library of Michigan to certify prior of July 15, of each year the public libraries qualified to receive penal fines and the population served by each and to receive reports from such libraries on their use of the penal fines.

The Regional Library Act, P.A. 250 of 1931, authorizes the Library of Michigan to develop a plan for regional libraries throughout the state and submit a proposal to supervisors (commissioners) of the two or more counties making up the proposed region for the formation of a regional library.

The State Aid to Public Libraries Act, P.A. 89 of 1977, gives extensive responsibility to the Library of Michigan in regulating all types of public libraries who receive state aid.

Sec. 9. Receive and approve plans for establishment of cooperative libraries.
Sec. 12. Receive and file membership records of cooperatives.
Sec. 15. Serve as communications link for cooperatives and upon adequate funding designate services deemed essential to good public library service.
Sec. 17. Set requirements for personnel for cooperatives and local libraries receiving state aid.
*Sec. 19. Certify qualifying cooperatives and public libraries for state aid.
Sec. 20. Exercise review authority over use and handling of state aid.

*Sec. 22. Adjudicate disputes related to membership in cooperatives.
Sec. 23. Consider total library provisions in carrying out the above responsibilities.
*Sec. 24. Promulgate rules for the administration of the act.

Various federal acts, directives and regulations authorize the Library of Michigan to administer state plans and otherwise act as agents relative to federal programs.

The statutes cited above indicate a clear authority relationship between the Library of Michigan and those public libraries and cooperatives receiving either state aid or penal fines. The role of the Library of Michigan is essentially two-fold, first regulatory then coordinative. This extremely broad mandate gives it limited power over local libraries but tremendous influence, as such, the potential for a mutually supported system is great. This was reflected in Goal II of the Library of Michigan Mission Statement (1988-91).

Goal II. Meeting the Administrative, Developmental and Technical Assistance Needs of Michigan Libraries of All Types.

Objectives

This is accomplished by:

A. Assessing library and information needs of Michigan citizens;
*B. Providing leadership, coordination and direction for Michigan library development;
C. Administering state aid to Michigan libraries;
D. Coordinating the penal fine distribution system;
E. Administering federal money for Michigan libraries;
F. Providing consultive service and technical assistance to Michigan libraries;
G. Collecting, publishing and distributing studies, statistics and other information regarding Michigan libraries;
H. Monitoring and planning for legislation relating to Michigan libraries and bringing the library and information needs of Michigan and its people to the attention of State Government;
I. Providing certification services and, on request, evaluative assessments to Michigan libraries; and
J. Providing public relations advice and assistance to Michigan libraries.

Reference is made also to the action statements related to these objectives as presented in the Library of Michigan Long Range Plan, 1 October 1985 to 30 September 1988.

Because of the diversity of Michigan public libraries, and because of their continued priority to serve all Michigan residents, we feel that the role of the Library of Michigan should focus strongly on the needs of public libraries. There is much to be done to close the gap between the extremes which exist between the six classes of Michigan public libraries before greater equity and interdependency can be accomplished.

Public Library Survey

Of the 378 public libraries in Michigan, only 172 of them responded to the Survey for Public Libraries. Because of the consistent collection of public library statistics and their availability through the Library of Michigan, the Public Libraries Subcommittee was interested in going beyond statistics to see what was the current state-of-the-art in resource sharing, networking, automation, and interdependency among public libraries.

The survey response underscores that a high degree of cooperation and resources sharing among libraries of all types is taking place and there there is critical need for strengthened coordination and funding without creating another layer of administrative bureaucracy.

The survey enhances the more formal, non-narrative statistical data of Michigan Public Library Statistics, 1986 by depicting the "ways" libraries share their resources and cope with information technological needs. It communicates librarians' concerns that funding for basic services must be in place before adding new interdependency and technological responsibilities.

The extent of the success of statewide networking and interdependency is reflected in the similar circumstances of the state's largest (Detroit Public Library, service population 1,203,368) and one of its smallest libraries (Topinabee, service population 934). Both participate in resource sharing through a public library cooperative and region of cooperation, interact with multitype libraries, are net lenders and need increased funding to realize their resource sharing potential. Each has borrowed from the other through the Statewide interloan network.

The survey shows that public libraries formally and informally network with each other and multitype libraries. Those reporting cite public library cooperatives (very predominantly) and regions of cooperation as their most useful formal network. UPRLC, OCULS, CORD, MLA, and MLC drew frequent citation. (Seven libraries said they do not know what a region of cooperation is.) The reporting libraries strongly endorse improved resource sharing (151 yes, 15 no) and favor state funding to underwrite multitype cooperation (136 yes, 7 no).

The public libraries report diverse programs to schools (predominant), community colleges and health science libraries, working through regions of cooperation and independently. Most share resources through union lists of serials and COMs. There is consensus that these are the fundamental base for interdependency and resource sharing that must be in place to support added efforts. 122 of 172 responding report they participate in union lists of serials, OCLC predominating.

Michigan public libraries hold more than 18 million volumes and 20 million items in their collection. In this survey, respondents report a wide array of in-depth, special collections, the majority concentrating on local or state history and local authors. Materials of these collections are shared largely through interlibrary loan. The survey's report of 141 libraries loaning 101,731 items and 155 borrowing 174,049 items appears flawed and severely understated. It may be the public libraries were only citing items loaned and borrowed with multitypes or the questions may have been misunderstood.

To extend their resources, the survey report shows public libraries are linked to a variety of 135 databases through varied vendors. OCLC predominates with 60 citing it as available in-house, 79 through group sharing. Local database systems of COM catalogs were reported by 26 of the 178 libraries reporting. 74 of the libraries have or participate in on-line catalogs, 22 have automated circulation, 12 electronic mail, and 6 telefacsimile. The survey's report that 16, 293 national on-line database searches were reported by 75 libraries (one reporting 12,000) seems flawed and understated as with the interloan statistics.

The libraries report that next to interloan, they consider sharing of professional expertise, audiovisual materials and rotating collections, group purchasing and cataloging and technical processing as vital.

The survey points up a wealth of resources in Michigan public libraries that are being shared to an increasingly larger degree with libraries strongly supporting their further development. It also points up weaknesses in the statewide library system that must be addressed if interdependency is to continue on a formal basis and be strengthened.

- Lack of on-going, valid, statistical networking information; database growth and participation; interloans within as well as among networks; origination and follow-through of database search requests, etc., to provide a true picture of where networking is nearing completion and where gaps exist.

- Lack of clear state goals toward which local and regional database planning can be aimed.

- Lack of standards for qualitative and quantitative levels of resources and services development.

- Slow document delivery and turnaround.

- The need of small and rural libraries for extra help to build ready reference collections, underwrite interloan telephone and postage costs and automate functions and services.

At the same time the respondents support increased funding for resource sharing and multitype cooperation, they consistently add the following caveats:

- Fund P.A. 89 fully first.

- Do not jeopardize present funding with new funding.

- A base level of support for all public libraries needs to be established and funded.

- Per capita distribution is fairest.

- A library receiving state support must agree to participate in resource sharing and open its collection to public use.

- A library receiving state support for resource sharing must meet network service standards.

- Rural and small libraries need extra on-going help to participate in electronic linking programs.

On the basis of the survey, it is recommended that:

- The Library of Michigan and the 16 public library cooperatives take a stronger coordinating and planning role for statewide networking and databasing, including development of more complete, on-going statistics to measure multitype resource sharing and participation.

- P.A. 89 funding should be strengthened before adding further resource sharing responsibilities to cooperatives and local public libraries.

- Networking and resource sharing funding should not be distributed in a manner that allows these funds to replace local funding responsibilities in any type library.

- A base level of resource sharing capability should be established and funded, working simultaneously to improve interdependency from the bottom up and top down, i.e. building local reference collections, automation capabilities, and telefaxes as appropriate in small to medium size libraries, while extending network linkages and integration at upper levels.

- Network plans should be considered for practicality and feasibility on an on-going basis. Funding should be predicated on a sustaining as well as start-up basis.

- A system of state subsidized reference back-up or information passes should be instituted to assist patrons in transfer of their search from a public to an academic library.

- All libraries should be reimbursed for provision of interloan services.

- All libraries participating in state subsidized multitype cooperation must make their collections accessible by the public.

The Public Libraries Subcommittee realized that of all the libraries in Michigan, there was more statistical information available for public libraries than any other. Because of the availability of so much statistical information, the committee chose to focus its attention on cooperation and resource sharing among libraries as well as networking and interdependency.

What the survey actually showed was that there is a great deal of effort towards resource sharing which could ultimately lead to greater interdependency if considerable support and guidance comes through the Library of Michigan for public libraries. The disparity between Class I and Class VI libraries must be addressed before interdependency can be fully realized throughout the state. Then, we will be able to talk about maximum library cooperation.

Library cooperation is based on the premise that libraries can improve services to their primary clientele and/or reduce expenses by working together. Libraries, even different types of libraries, have similar needs for access to information and materials, staff training and continuing education, and improved discounts on materials and supplies. During the past few years as different types of libraries have started working more closely together in the statewide Regions of Cooperation, they have discovered new ways to meet these needs.

Regions of Cooperation

Regions of Cooperation have been successful in fostering and increasing multitype library cooperation and that activity should be continued and strengthened. Rather than create a new administrative structure, however, it would be more efficient if the role of public library cooperatives was expanded to include service for all types of libraries. Since the geographical area of the Regions of Cooperation is, for the most part, the same as that of public library cooperatives, and since public library cooperatives are acting as fiscal agents for the regions and since the services offered are somewhat similar, the two organizations could easily be merged.

In order to do this successfully, additional funding would need to be provided at a high enough level so that funding for the present public library members of cooperatives would not be undercut. Public library cooperatives are inadequately funded at present, so it would first be necessary to fully fund P.A. 89 of 1977 and then to provide additional funding to extend those services to other types of libraries.

Governance of the cooperatives would need to be changed to allow adequate representation for other types of libraries and still provide public libraries with the assurance that the new structure would continue existing services. The role of the REMC and its relationship to school libraries also needs to be clearly defined.

Multitype library cooperatives would help meet the needs expressed above for access to information and materials, shared expertise, shared continuing education and training, etc. Some of these needs could be met fairly easily but providing adequate access to information and materials needs to be discussed further.

One of the dangers of resource sharing is that libraries which receive inadequate local support to meet the needs of most of their primary clientele may abuse their privilege. Safeguards need to be established so that access to materials located elsewhere is not used as an excuse for reducing the local level of support. Adequate local funding can be encouraged by requiring a minimum level of standards for participation in a multitype library cooperation and by providing state aid to those institutions which meet a minimum level of standards.

Further requirements for successful resource sharing include the ability to identify the location of needed material and information quickly and easily, the ability to transmit requests and then to deliver the material and information quickly and efficiently. Cooperatives would be able to develop mechanisms for meeting these needs within each cooperative but additional state funding and leadership is needed to do this on a statewide basis.

The building blocks of any cooperative resource sharing network are the local libraries that participate in the network. Those libraries need to have a staff and collection of materials that is adequate to meet most of the needs of their primary clientele. Public libraries need legislation and financial incentives that will encourage cities, townships and villages to provide an adequate level of financial support.

Role of Local Units of Government

Legislation needs to be passed that would require townships and cities to provide access to library service for their residents. Since most townships and cities presently have public libraries or have contracts for library service, it might be possible for this law to pass without too much difficulty. The law could then be used by libraries as a bargaining point in negotiating contracts with cities, townships and villages.

Incentive funding needs to be made available to encourage cities, townships and villages to jointly support libraries which could achieve an adequate level of service rather than support separate sub-standard libraries.

The most important determinates of good local library service are the availability of a professional staff and an adequate collection. Incentive funding needs to be provided to encourage smaller public libraries to hire a professional librarian. Additional incentive funding needs to be provided to encourage all libraries to maintain adequate materials collections.

Recommendations:

A. Local Public Libraries

- Public libraries meeting minimum standards should continue to receive state aid.
- Legislation should be passed that requires all cities, townships and villages to provide access for their residents to public library service.
- A special state aid grant should be given to district libraries that meet minimum standards. This would encourage cities, townships and villages to work together rather than separately in providing library service.
- A special state aid grant should be given to libraries under 25,000 population that hire a director with an ALA accredited MLS degree. This would allow more smaller libraries to have a professional staff.
- Public libraries should receive matching grants from the state for all funds spent on library materials that exceed a minimum percent of their budget. This would encourage public libraries to allocate adequate funds for materials.

B. Multitype Cooperatives

- The role of public library cooperatives should be expanded to include service to all types of libraries. All types of libraries within the geographical area of the cooperative would be eligible to become members if they met minimum standards and were willing to make their materials available to other libraries in the cooperative.
- Multitype cooperatives would receive state aid that would include a base grant and additional funding based on the cooperative's geographical service area and the primary clientele of its members.
- Each multitype cooperative would have a board of nine members. Each board would be required to have at least one representative from each type of library (academic, public, school, and special). Other seats on the board could represent various types or sizes of libraries depending on the make-up of each cooperative.
- Each multitype cooperative would employ a full-time director.

- Multitype cooperatives would file a plan of service with the Library of Michigan each year. The plan of service would list the services to be provided and explain in detail how those services were to be provided. The plan of service would describe the role that REMCs would play within the cooperative in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of services.

- Multitype cooperatives would provide access for member libraries to a consolidated regional database which would allow member libraries to enter one search and retrieve all of the holdings for that title owned by libraries within the cooperative.

- Multitype cooperatives would contribute MARC records from the regional database to a statewide database.

- Multitype cooperatives would provide interlibrary loan service meeting performance standards established by the Library of Michigan. This service would be available to all members but would not replace existing interlibrary loan arrangements unless the members so desired.

- Multitype cooperatives would provide financial support for interlibrary loan lenders in the cooperative.

- Multitype cooperatives would fund an information/reference referral center located within the cooperative and meeting performance standards set by the Library of Michigan.

- Multitype cooperatives would provide access to five CEUs of continuing education programs within the cooperative each year.

- Multitype cooperatives would provide other services as determined by their members.

C. Library of Michigan

- The Library of Michigan should fund a statewide database. This database needs to be structured so that holdings within the state could be located quickly and easily using only a few searches to retrieve the holdings within the state.

- The Library of Michigan should fund statewide information and reference referral centers. These reference centers would be used as a backup source for information requests that are not filled by reference centers within the cooperative. The major research libraries as defined by P.A. 371 of 1972 could be designated as reference referral centers and each assigned a geographic and/or subject area as a primary responsibility.

- The Library of Michigan should develop a communications network to transmit requests quickly and efficiently throughout the state.

If interdependency and resource sharing are to be the primary goals for Michigan libraries, the bottom line as incentive for this goal must be funding. Just as P.A. 89 is paramount to the continued operation of Cooperatives and Regions of Cooperation, there must be added funding for public libraries in order to first allow them to participate cooperatively with the resource sharing with all types of libraries, and secondly, to assist them with further development of collections which will improve resources and strengthen access to them. Funding is always the "bottom line" for any comprehensive proposal.

Local tax money provides 75.1% of the funds used by public libraries in Michigan. If penal fines and miscellaneous local revenues are included, 93% of the support of public libraries comes from local sources.

- The most common source of public library support is a general fund appropriation from the library's governmental parent. This means that the library's services and costs are made accountable to the legislative body of its municipality and must be evaluated in comparison with other services, many of them mandatory.

- An appreciable number of public libraries are supported by revenues from tax levies voted by the people. District libraries, township libraries, many city libraries and an increasing number of school district libraries are financed in this way. It has the advantage of being dependable, but the disadvantage of being rigid and difficult to change. The mechanics of voted tax levies are variable.

  State law provides for a permanent tax levy for Township libraries at the time of establishment.

  Home rule charters can, and some do, provide for set millage for a library, but the patterns can vary greatly depending on prior planning.

  The usual method of getting voted millage is by ballot for a set period for a levy outside the millage limitation. The all or nothing threat at each renewal tends to place the library in a somewhat precarious position because of the effect of other situations on such votes. District libraries are especially vulnerable, having a less clearly identified relationship to their parent municipalities.

- Penal fines in 1987 averaged 10.7% of total public library revenues. While significant, this would not necessarily be critical if the pattern were even, but it isn't. The smaller the library, the larger its dependence on penal fines. In terms of averages, libraries serving under 3,000 population derived 22% of their total revenue from penal fines. Libraries from 3,000 – 5,000 derived 21% and libraries from 5,000 – 13,000 derived 23%. Whatever one may believe theoretically about penal fines, their loss would destroy the rural network of library outlets serving a very large portion of the State.

- Michigan law allows almost any kind of library or municipality to contract with any other library or municipality to give or receive library service on mutually agreed terms. The Penal Fine Act of 1964 established County Penal Fine Boards and authorized them to contract for services to unserved areas. Many unserved areas of the state have contracted with neighboring libraries as a result of these legal options and many more could do so if they could arrange to spend the equivalent of .3 mill on their State Equalized Valuation to meet minimum state aid requirements.

- 1987 State Aid to local libraries is approximately 7.6% of the revenue for local public libraries.

- State Aid to cooperatives was projected in P.A. 89 of 1977 as their primary support and at that time was set at 50¢ per capita. Appropriations have never reached these levels and the largest distribution to date of this writing will be 37.5¢.

- Miscellaneous revenues such as overdue book charges, gifts, rental fees, etc., are generally of minor significance.

Michigan has a long history of public library development, which has managed to keep up to a degree, with the changing needs. While solidly based on local effort, public libraries have moved step by step into larger units of service and networking structures on a slow consistent basis. If the future can show stronger support through the Library of Michigan, combined with full funding for P.A. 89 and added incentives for the unique public libraries throughout the state mandated to serve all of its residents, then we will see strong interdependency and networking and Michigan will once again move into the forefront of leadership and innovation.

Standards

The Public Libraries Subcommittee looked one step further in its examination of both current and future needs as they relate to Interdependency and Funding, and determined that the internal organization and procedures for public libraries needs to be carefully examined in terms of standards, if we are to look for long-range changes and improvements in library services throughout Michigan. It should be responsibility of the Library of Michigan to work with all types of libraries in an attempt to establish standards which will help to advance excellence, continue to support growth through incentives, and assist in determining levels of financial support for public libraries as well as all types of libraries.

One of the most frequently quoted definitions for library standards was developed in 1968 by the South African Library Association, Subcommittee on Public Library Standards:

> Library standards are defined as the criteria by which...library services may be measured and assessed. They are determined by professional librarians in order to attain and maintain the objectives they have set themselves. Standards may be interpreted variously as the pattern of an ideal, a model procedure, a measure for appraisal, a stimulus for future development and improvement, as an instrument to assist decision and action not only by librarians themselves, but by the laymen concerned indirectly with the institution, planning, and administration of...library service.

In the United States, national library standards have not been revised since 1966. The current trend is the development of local planning documents which will establish "standards" appropriate to local conditions and needs. Acceptance of the local plan will theoretically insure an individual library's ability to meet its own goals with strategies endorsed by local funding units of government. The planning process is cyclical, involving continuous monitoring and evaluation. This trend toward the development of local standards was initiated in 1980 and has worked with varying degrees of acceptance and success.

Concern for national library standards appeared as early as 1917 in library professional publications. However, the first formal document on standards for public libraries was developed by the American Library Association in 1933. It provided a funding formula for minimum allocations of $1 per capita, dependent upon the size, location, and characteristics of the community. In subsequent years, national standards developed by this nation's largest professional association for librarians has revised and expanded public library standards.

1943	Post-War Standards for Public Libraries
1948	A National Plan for Public Library Services
1956	Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation, with Minimum Standards
1962	Interim Standards for Small Public Libraries
1963	Standards of Quality for Bookmobile Service
1964	Standards for Children's Services in Public Libraries
1967	Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, 1966

In addition to the above formal standards, various divisions of the American Library Association have developed less formal guidelines and/or strategies for improved public library service for young adults, audiovisual materials, and older adults, among others.

Various states have also adopted standards over the last twenty-five (25) years. For the most part, those state standards have been adaptations of national standards.

New York state standards have historically been required, not recommended, for local receipt of state aid. All revenue, local as well as state, could be withheld if a minimum level of service was not maintained.

As state aid levels increased, more states began to impose criterion for receipt of funds. In reality, these criterion are generally modest for most states.

Michigan has no formal required or recommended standards for public library services. The Library of Michigan "guidelines" for state aid require a minimum local support level of 3/10 mil; a sliding scale dependent upon population for hours open to the public; and minimum certified staffing. Smaller libraries serving under 12,000 population need not have a librarian who has acquired a Master's Degree from an accredited library school.

Libraries in Michigan are well known both for their diversity and for their independence. Any standards that would be adopted need to be flexible enough to allow this diversity and independence to continue.

Standards need to vary according to library size with different standards for small, medium and large public libraries.

Standards need to be tied to the Public Library Planning Process and need to vary according to the role or roles selected by each library.

Standards need to be set for different degrees of excellence so that they would be both inspirational and reachable.

A combination of input (number of volumes, number of seats, number of staff, etc.), output (public library planning process), and practical (legal library board, written board bylaws, written policies, telephone, etc.) standards are needed.

Standards need to be tied to funding to have any significant effect on library service. Any new standards/funding that is adopted should "hold harmless" any existing public library. State Aid should continue to be paid based on existing requirements. Additional funding should be provided as incentive for libraries to meed higher standards of quality and excellence.

Recommendations:

- Keep the present standards and funding for State Aid with no changes. Funding for the new standards would not start until state aid is funded at the 50¢ per capita level.
- Establish new standards for quality library service using both input and output measures but also including some basic check list requirements. These standards need to vary according to population size, selected planning process role(s), and level of quality (adequate, good, excellent). The standards adopted by Illinois, New York, and Wisconsin provide excellent models for this approach.

- Establish an accreditation process for libraries that would give libraries meeting the standards public recognition and some financial reward. For example, libraries meeting an adequate level of service for their size and selected role would be accredited by the state and would receive an additional 5¢ per capita. Libraries meeting an above average level of service would be accredited with distribution and would receive an additional 5¢ per capita. Libraries meeting the highest level would be accredited with highest distinction and would receive a third 5¢ per capita.

- Accreditation would provide an excellent incentive for communities to maintain funding for their library. This would have great PR opportunities and might include a special seal that could be displayed on the library door, letterhead, etc., and would provide libraries with special recognition.

- The Library of Michigan would be responsible for accrediting public libraries and would need appropriate staff and funding for this service. Libraries wishing to be accredited would apply to the Library of Michigan. Those libraries would be visited by an accreditation committee to verify that all requirements had been met. The committee would include members from different types of libraries and different geographical areas in order to ensure that the standards were applied consistently throughout the state. Libraries meeting the requirements would be then accredited for a five year period. The five year period is recommended to reduce the amount of funding that would be required if all 378 public libraries needed to be accredited each year.

Standards formulation remains an important library issue. The American Library Association endorses the development of local standards based upon community need and a community-formulated service plan. Some states are endorsing local planning, yet creating basic or minimum standards for all public libraries in the state. Compliance with state standards may be "recommended" or may be "required" for local receipt of state aid or per capita support funding. Revised, workable standards for Michigan libraries need to be formulated and implemented.

Public Libraries Subcommittee

Summary of Recommendations

The Public Libraries Subcommittee's Recommendations are divided into four (4) prioritized categories: 1) *Funding*; 2) *Library of Michigan*; 3) *Standards*; and 4) *Interdependency*. Within each category the recommendations are again in priority order.

Funding

1. **Recommend that Public Act 89, 1977, "The State Aid to Public Libraries Act", be funded at a 1989 level of $1.00 per capita in each of the three categories of State Aid as listed in Sections 13, 16(2) and 16(4) of the Act; that the geographic density factor in Section 16(4) be increased from $10.00 to $30.00; that the county reimbursement for head librarian's salary be increased from $4,800 to $15,000 in Section 16(5) with the county contribution to the library increased from $3,600 to $10,000.**

   In order to meet the Constitutional mandate that public libraries shall allow access to their resources to all of the residents of the State of Michigan, public libraries need to receive stronger state support. In 1987, only 7.6% of the income to public libraries came from state support, yet their doors are open to all residents of the state, students and faculty of colleges and universities, as well as public school students. Public libraries must meet minimum requirements and belong to a library cooperative before they may receive state aid. Public libraries are the primary access to information for the majority of the residents of the state, yet they receive minimal support to allow them to strengthen library collections, access networks, implement automation programs and participate in greater resource sharing activities. Stronger funding through cooperatives is one way in which public library service can be dramatically improved.

2. **Recommend that public libraries should receive matching incentive grants from the state for all funds expended for library materials in excess of a minimum percent of their annual budget.**

   An incentive program implemented at the state level which would provide matching dollars as an incentive to public libraries to boost materials budgets would greatly improve library collections statewide. For example, the incentive could be divided by class size for libraries. A minimum percentage for a class 6 library could be 12% of the total budget, for example, and a state grant could be awarded in increments for libraries meeting the minimum annual expenditure. This would encourage library boards to allocate adequate funds for materials so that they would qualify for incentive grants. It would also discourage libraries from making cuts in their materials budgets in order to fund other programs.

3. **Recommend that state grants be given to libraries serving populations under 25,000 that hire a director with an ALA accredited MLS degree.**

   Public service may remain substandard in many ways if smaller libraries do not receive incentives which warrant stronger leadership and professional management. State aid grants to libraries serving smaller populations would provide the incentive to hire professional librarians to organize and direct the operations of library services and give stronger emphasis to the full range of information options to the public.

4. **Recommend that state aid grants should be given to district libraries that have been organized and that meet minimum standards.**

   The emphasis for this recommendation is to encourage the district library concept as a stronger alternative for smaller libraries. The future life of many small and isolated public libraries may depend upon local governments working together, rather than separately, through the formation of district libraries serving a larger geographical area, but providing a strong consolidated library service. Grants through the state would encourage townships, villages, cities and counties to consider a consolidation effort and formation of district libraries. Stronger resource sharing, collections, and overall library service would result in a better network of public libraries throughout Michigan.

5. **Recommend that legislation be introduced requiring all cities, townships and villages to be responsible for providing access to public library service for their residents.**

   Public library service throughout the State of Michigan is very spotty. In some counties, there is county-wide library service, while in others there is no service at all. Some residents must travel long distances while others have the convenience of library service nearby. In order to encourage literacy and provide access to information for all of the residents of the state, cities, townships and villages should be responsible for negotiating whatever is necessary to provide access to public library service for their residents.

Library of Michigan

1. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan undertake as a top priority, public library access to a statewide database.**

   The Library of Michigan should fund a statewide database structured so that the holdings of libraries throughout Michigan could be located quickly and easily. Priority could be given to expand access to the MERIT network, or other statewide database so that public libraries and cooperatives could actively promote resource sharing. Public libraries frequently lack the necessary funding to move into database access and the mission of the Library of Michigan could give priority to bring the state and its libraries together through such a program which would fund the program and create equal access to all of the residents of the state through all public libraries.

2. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan assume an active advocacy role for all types of libraries in Michigan.**

   Public libraries cross all of the boundaries of age, ethnic, social and economic boundaries as they serve the broad needs and interests of the public. They have been mandated by the Constitution to serve all residents regardless of where they reside. The demands on service and collections require that public libraries have strong representation and support through the Library of Michigan. The Library of Michigan needs to demonstrate a stronger advocacy role for public libraries and work with the legislature to strengthen library funding, technological development, resource sharing, and public library visibility in Michigan.

3. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan fund statewide information and reference referral centers.**

   The major research libraries as defined by P.A. 371 of 1972, could be designated as reference referral centers and each assigned a geographic and/or subject area as a primary responsibility. These reference centers would be used as a backup resource for information requests which cannot be filled through small libraries and cooperatives. They would encourage stronger networking among types of libraries as well as stimulate resource sharing.

4. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan assume full responsibility for publishing and emphasizing all special collections housed in public libraries throughout Michigan.**

   From the survey conducted as a part of the Task Force on Interdependency and Funding Public Library Subcommittee, a number of important and unique special collections were revealed that previously had little or no publicity. The special collections, if organized and published fully throughout the state, could become a valuable resource for sharing to all types of libraries in Michigan. They represent a little known, but potentially strong asset which needs attention and promotion.

5. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan develop a communications network to transmit requests quickly and efficiently throughout the state.**

   In an age where information has become a top commodity for individuals as well as for business and industry, communication networks become a high priority for libraries in accessing and delivering information. In the interest of serving the residents of the state, the Library of Michigan should undertake to develop and support a communication network which will be a part of every library or cooperative service center, and which will assist in and promote the quick and efficient delivery of information to the residents of Michigan through public libraries.

6. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan should, with established guidelines, fund through the state all of the Subregional Libraries for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.**

   Once primarily a service provided through the state library, service to the blind and physically handicapped has now been established in subregional libraries in various locations throughout the state. Funding is not adequate to support the basic service and the libraries must pull funding from local library budgets to provide the minimum levels of service to our residents. Funding for this service should come through the state in sufficient amounts to fully fund the service without impacting local library budgets. Current service can best be described as sub standard, minimal, and totally inadequate as we move towards the future and higher numbers of older Michigan residents. The Library of Michigan should either assume the full responsibility for adequate funding for each of the subregional libraries or resume both housing and administration of the programs at the state level.

7. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan promote a strong, joint leadership role between itself and all types of libraries within the state.**

   Networking, resource sharing, interdependency...all can only be achieved with strong support and leadership through the Library of Michigan. Public libraries need to be recognized and valued for the unique and important role they assume in dealing with the residents of the state. Public libraries need to become an integral part of the network of libraries serving all of the residents of Michigan. The responsibility for bringing all libraries together, promoting them, and advancing them into the future as a model for other states to see and follow belongs to the Library of Michigan.

Standards

1. **Recommend that new standards for quality public library service be created by the Library of Michigan working jointly with public libraries in the state.**

   Using both input and output measures, but including some basic checklist requirements, new standards need to be created and set for different degrees of excellence in public libraries. Standards should vary according to the population size (small, medium, large public libraries), level of quality for library service, and with an incentive program encouraging all public libraries to meet higher standards. New standards would include an incentive funding program for libraries as they improve quality of collections, local funding, excellence in the standards for service and standards for staffing. Present standards and funding for state aid would continue with no change until new standards were established and implemented concurrent with increased funding at the suggested $1.00 per capita level.

2. **Recommend that an accreditation process for public libraries be established with a funding incentive for those meeting the standards for accreditation-with-excellence.**

   As an incentive for improving local services, funding, and programs, an accreditation process would be established which would outline minimum standards for adequate-to-excellent levels of service. The accreditation and standards would be created to reflect the size and role of each library. Libraries meeting an "above average" level of service as defined by the process, would be accredited with distinction and would receive an additional 5¢ per capita. Libraries meeting "excellent" ratings would receive accreditation with the highest distinction and would receive 15¢ per capita. Accreditation would provide an excellent incentive for communities to work to maintain and build stronger local funding for public libraries, and it would also provide excellent public relations and promotional opportunities. Libraries could apply for accreditation and if approved would hold same for a 3 to 5 year period.

3. **Recommend that minimum standards and guidelines be re-defined for library cooperatives.**

   There is significant inequity among library cooperatives in Michigan. The services provided by the cooperatives differ dramatically. While there needs to be flexibility and diversity within each cooperative, it would appear that there is a need to re-examine the role of the cooperatives for consistency, services, and structure. The importance of the cooperatives is not in question, but the manner in which they interpret their purpose may now need to be re-evaluated.

Interdependency

1. **Recommend that a statewide library card be established in Michigan for use in all types of libraries.**

   In accordance with the Constitutional mandate that all public libraries be accessible for use by all of the citizens of our state, it is recommended that we study the example implemented in Pennsylvania called, "ACCESS PENNSYLVANIA". The system was initiated in 1986 in 23 counties on a trial basis and in 1987 it was extended to all 67 counties of the state. It allows any person registered as a resident to borrow materials at a participating library without fee. The success of the program has reported an average 10% increase in the use of library materials since the barriers have been removed. Compensation is paid by the state to libraries lending materials to other libraries when it is not practical for clients to visit them. The reimbursement compensation covers the full cost of lending materials and thus eliminates the fees which are normally charged to the clients. Cost for delivery of the materials is also subsidized by the state. A library card in Pennsylvania opens 600 public libraries and 22 million books to residents of that state. True resource sharing has been achieved.

2. **Recommend that a study be made to consider combining cooperatives and regions of cooperation into one multitype library cooperative.**

   Library cooperation is based on the premise that libraries can improve services to their primary clientele and/or reduce expenses by working together. While regions of cooperation have been successful in fostering and increasing multitype library cooperation, the possibility of eliminating one level of bureaucracy and combining it with another existing service (public library cooperatives) needs to be considered. Multitype cooperatives could help meet all current needs and foster still stronger interdependency, funding and overall sharing between all types of libraries. Governance for such an organization would need to be changed and carefully constructed to allow adequate representation for all types of libraries. Public libraries would need assurance that existing levels of service would continue, but new possibilities would also open between all libraries within the new cooperative. Since the basic geographical area for the regions of cooperation is, for the most part, the same as the public library cooperatives, and since the public library cooperatives are acting as the fiscal agents for the regions of cooperation, and because services offered are similar, the two organizations might be merged, more strongly funded, and the move would be beneficial to promoting interdependency in the state.

3. **Recommend that regional libraries in Michigan be encouraged to reorganize as district libraries.**

   Currently there is only one (1) regional library still in existence in the state. Under Michigan law, other types of libraries have become stronger and more desirable in terms of the advantages and support under the law. An incentive to encourage libraries to consider consolidation into district libraries should be established by the Library of Michigan.

4. **Recommend that the growing dependency between public libraries and school libraries throughout the state be studied by the Library of Michigan.**

   Many public libraries are finding an ever increasing demand to act as the school library in many communities. This is due to the increasing budget cuts in school programs which either reduces school library budgets and personnel, or eliminates them altogether. Albeit, the public library serves all of the public, but it is caught in the dilemma of serving the full-range needs for students and teachers without any additional funding to support the strong and growing demand for materials and services. A joint study between the Library of Michigan and the State Department of Education could be undertaken as and interdependency effort to determine the scope of the problem and possible recommendations for funding support or other solutions.

Section 8

School Libraries Subcommittee Report

Burton H. Brooks, Chair
Kevin Flaherty
George Grimes
Charles Hanson

School Libraries Subcommittee

Report

Overview

School libraries are the most numerous and the most diverse of Michigan's libraries. Though exact figures are not available, there are an estimated 4.000 school libraries in the state's more than 500 school districts. These libraries range from small rooms with hundreds of books to large, many-thousand square foot sophisticated media centers with collections of tens of thousands of materials including books, audiovisual media and up-to-date technological software as well as sophisticated hardware.

Two surveys each were sent out to 648 schools. More than 300 survey sets were returned representing a good cross section of Michigan's school libraries. The first survey was generic and was sent out to all types of libraries across the state, while the second survey was based on a national instrument developed by Marilyn L. Miller and Barbara Moran. The Miller survey allows comparison of Michigan data with national survey information.

The generic survey was compiled by the Library of Michigan staff. Professor Helen Snoke of the University of Michigan School of Information and Library Studies supervised the compilation and analysis of the more extensive survey instrument. Though not totally surprising to Library of Michigan school subcommittee members, the results of the survey paint a gloomier picture of Michigan school library media centers than expected. Many of the survey replies from across the state exude a cry of desperation of those school library staff trying to fill needs, but with extremely limited resources and support. Certainly the most limited resource, and the most important – professionally trained teacher-certified librarians (media specialists) – is not provided in a high percentage of elementary libraries, though professional staffing is usually provided in high school library media centers.

To illustrate the frustration and hopelessness expressed by many of the respondents in the surveys, following are a few of the actual quotations from the 1988 survey instruments which were returned to the Library of Michigan by school district personnel: "$1,814 (Chapter II) sent to high school. Rest of budget cut 16% due to failure of millage. Second millage failure will mean $zero budget next year"..."Budget cuts – can't pass millage – state aid cuts"..."The 86-87 school budget was better than the current year. All of my budgets were cut and not reinstated until late December. It has only been since early March that there were magazines on the racks. I received no supplies money this year. Our school system is planning more cuts for the 88-89 year. My budget may again be cut. This means that my high school students do not even have current magazines – or Reader's Guide to do research. That puts an added drain on the public library system."..."Sorry items on this survey are not applicable to our school. Our library has not been staffed or maintained for over five years.

Audiovisual equipment is stored in other locations due to theft and vandalism."... "Standard budget guidelines for libraries need to be set up in our state in order to reduce inequities in collections and resources available in public schools. If libraries are to be the major source of knowledge in a school, they need to be maintained properly. Without guidelines, schools such as mine have a library in name only. The only subjects worth researching in our facility are historical topics because the collection is hopelessly out of date"..."Due to lack of money available to our district, we were forced to eliminate our elementary library two years ago. We have not had local funding for a media center since 1981. We rely on our local REMC and federal money for all materials."..."Filling out this survey has helped me realize how far we've come in our library and how far we need to go."..."Without professional staff or adequate funding, our library basically serves as a lending source for children's books. All other services which should be handled by the LMC are sporadically and casually provided by the principal and teaching staff as time and resources allow"... "We need help! The small rural school districts do not have the money to update or purchase new things. Most of the books we have in our library were copyrighted in 1960's or 1970's. We can't afford to replace them"..."Our book budget has fallen from approximately $2,000 in 1973 to a low of $00 this year. There has been a corresponding drop in the AV budget. (All AV funds were consumed by the purchase of projector lamps.) Our district, like many others, has serious budget problems, compounded by the fact that this Board of Education totally refuses to make any cuts in its sports programs."...and finally, a glimmer of hope from one survey — "I am a new superintendent on this job having been here only since September, 1987. Our library media center is almost non-existent and totally inadequate. My major goal is build, equip, and staff a new LMC as soon as possible. To this end, we are planning for this and have hired an architect."

Another great disparity, as the preceding quotes often cite, is the funding provided for purchase of library materials for school libraries. These budgets range from nothing to more than an estimated $30 per pupil. The more generous budgets are usually provided in schools which already have relatively good collections and resources, while low budgets tend to perpetuate the "have-not" status of the poorly supported school library programs.

The quality of school library programs rests solely in the hands of local Boards of Education, which strapped for funds to run their school districts, often provide only minimal resources for school library media programs. The regional North Central standards for school library-media programs and the University of Michigan Bureau of Accreditation and School Improvement Student Standards provide only quantitative guidelines for funding, staffing and collections. Even these standards are very flexible, particularly in periods of funding difficulties. National standards do exist for school library programs. Perhaps the most far-reaching school library standards were the 1960 **Standards for School Libraries**. These standards paralleled the availability of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title II funds virtually dedicated for school library resources, the building of new schools and media centers accommodating expanding populations, and recognition of the school library as a functional part of the school program. Revised and updated national standards/guidelines were published in 1969 and 1975, but neither had the impact of the 1960 standards.

This year's **Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs** jointly published by the American Library Association division – American Association of School Libraries (AASL), and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) redefines guidelines and goals for school library media programs which are achievable and incorporate new technologies which all libraries hope to utilize. Bolstered by other professional organizations, AASL and AECT have set their sights upon the acceptance of these 1988 guidelines as the goal for school library media programs.

A current, serious problem for school libraries is the lack of any advocacy at the state level. Prior to establishment of the Library of Michigan, school library services and programs were represented by up to four consultants at the State Library, when it was part of the Department of Education. When the Library of Michigan was moved from the Department of Education, school library advocacy fell between the cracks. The charge of the Library of Michigan (P.A. 540, 1982) refers to school libraries. Legislation (P.A. 141, 1988) has been recently enacted which will encourage the Department of Education to create a consultant position for school library-media program support.

These glimmers of light – the expected heavy influence of **Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs** and the passage of P.A. 141, 1988 – are only the first of many changes needed to improve school library media programs as Michigan moves toward meeting the information needs of the next century. The following recommendations address, more specifically, concrete proposals to improve the status of school libraries in Michigan.

Attachment 1

School Library Media Programs

Legislative Authority and Adopted Policy

Statutory references to libraries or media centers governed by school boards are found in the Library of Michigan Act, Section 10, and the School Code of 1976, Sections 206, 351, 473, 671, 1264, 1264a, 1451, and 1452.

The Library of Michigan Act (1982 PA 540, MCL 397.11 et seq.) indicates the legislative mandate for the Library of Michigan in Section 10 (MCL 397.20) related to school and all kinds of libraries:

- "(f) Further, by all appropriate means, the development of effective, statewide school library services."
- "(g) Encourage contractual and cooperative arrangements between and among all kinds of libraries for the improvement of library services to the people of this state."
- "(h) Coordinate the library's library services with the library services of all kinds of libraries."
- "(i) Collect, preserve, and publish appropriate statistics on all kinds of libraries in the state."
- "(j) Conduct research and publish the results for the benefit of all kinds of libraries and the library services to the people of the state..."

The School Code of 1976 (1976 PA 451, MCL 380.1 et seq.) provides for school libraries/media centers and public libraries in Sections 260, 351, 473, 1264, 1264a, 1451, and 1452. Section 671 (MCL 380.671) provides for the creation and operation of a statewide network of Regional Educational Media Centers (REMCs), which are defined as programs "approved by the superintendent of public instruction which provides basic educational services to local or constituent school districts." The associated Rules and Regulations define media as "all forms of communications and their associated support systems." Services which may be included are:

- Materials lending library
- Duplication services
- Delivery and dissemination system
- Professional leadership training
- Acquisition and use of curriculum materials
- Technical and maintenance services
- Professional library services
- Centralized purchasing
- Graphics production services

Section 1264a of the School Code of 1976, MCL 380.1264a (1976 PA 451, as amended by 1988 PA 141) established criteria for local school district media programs and centers. Such programs should:

- Provide students' reading, viewing and listening experiences
- Assist students in developing skills in locating, selecting and evaluating media forms
- Assist teachers in designing, organizing, analyzing, implementing, and evaluating media oriented activities
- Establish a procedure of selecting and developing a media collection that meets oriented learning activities
- Organize and maintains materials in a media collection
- Provide library media services to students through delivery systems using computers, telecommunications, and interactive technology
- Plan, administer, and evaluate the library media program
- Provide assistance to students and teachers engaged in the design and creation of library media program materials
- Assist in the maintenance and acquisition of professional resources
- Work cooperatively with the Department of Education, regional educational media center, and regional library

On December 16, 1986, the State Board of Education approved a policy on educational technology which states, in part, that:

> The State Board of Education recognizes that technology is having and will continue to have a significant impact on the citizens of Michigan and the nation. The State Board of Education will assume an active leadership role by promising the informed use of technology as a part of school management and student learning at all levels.[1]

To that end, the State Board of Education directed the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop an annual plan that addresses the following components:[2]

- Provide technical assistance to districts as they develop local and regional plans;

- Assist in the development of funding options for the acquisition of hardware and software;

- Act as a clearinghouse for the dissemination of innovative applications of technology;

- Develop strategies to insure that teachers and building-level administrators are trained in the use of technology as a key to instructional change at the building level;

- Develop an evaluation and reporting system to be submitted to the State Board on an annual basis.

Based on this policy statement, the State Board adopted a Technology Plan on September 8, 1987. This plan provides a background analysis, needs statement, recommendations for management of the plan, and goals and objectives (with supporting activities and indicators of success). No definition of educational technology is provided, however.

The Library of Michigan, as well as the Michigan State Board of Education, clearly have a legislative mandate to promote and provide school library media program service to the children and youth of our state.

References

[1] Michigan State Board of Education "Policy on Educational Technology", December, 1986.

[2] Michigan State Board of Education "Technology Plan", September, 1987.

School Libraries Subcommittee

Recommendations

1. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan actively and widely publicize the critical status of hundreds of Michigan school library/media center programs by disseminating the results of the 1988 school library survey to the State Board of Education, local boards of education, professional educational associations, and particularly, to the general public.**

   A close examination of the surveys used to collect data about school library/media programs revealed an extremely gloomy picture of the school library programs in Michigan. To best understand the problems, actual study of the survey results is required. School libraries are the basis for all library programs in Michigan – if we don't start out students with good school libraries which help them grow and understand the value of libraries, we will soon have an unenlightened citizenry which, in the future, may well not support libraries, whatever the type. Furthermore, on a more immediate basis, the Task Force has recommended greatly increased cooperation and networking among all types of libraries and, unless school library resources are improved, they will not be effective contributors to proposed cooperative, networking efforts. True interdependency mandates strong local units before cooperative efforts can be successful. Additionally, poor school libraries create a negative drain on all other types of libraries, particularly public and academic libraries. This drain creates service problems for public and academic libraries which have traditionally cooperated with school libraries, but are not equipped to replace them, which is rapidly becoming reality in some parts of the state.

   Finally, in order to begin immediate rectification of the problem, a recommendation should be made to the Department of Education and Legislature that a portion of school aid be earmarked for school library/media center programs with funds being made available for both materials and staff. Incentives should be part of the funding package to encourage school districts to provide matching funds to those provided in the state school library/media center aid package.

   Only by providing funding help as part of the school aid package will the real importance of school library media centers be recognized and the problems therein start being solved.

2. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan develop effective inter-departmental cooperation with the Department of Education, under whose supervision Michigan school libraries currently takes place, with specific endorsement of the MAME legislation (P.A. 141, 1988) for the establishment of a school library media center advisory committee.**

The School Libraries Subcommittee recognizes that when the Library of Michigan and Department of Education were separated from each other that the responsibility for school library/media center development was not assumed by either agency. However, with the passage of P.A. 141, 1988, which recognizes school library media centers, it is also time for the Library of Michigan and State Department of Education to work together in whatever avenues possible. In short, it is imperative that both agencies achieve a high degree of cooperation and coordination in their approach to school library/media center programs so that maximum effectiveness can be realized and costly duplication avoided.

3. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan support the designation of a school library media consultant within the Department of Education, and appoint a staff person of the Library of Michigan as official liaison with the Department of Education for school library cooperative activities.**

   The School Libraries Subcommittee recommends that a staff person of the Library of Michigan be appointed as official liaison with the Department of Education for school library cooperative activities. This individual shall assist the Library of Michigan in fulfilling its mandate to gather and analyze statistics relative to school library/media centers. This individual shall likewise assist both Departments to monitor compliance with approved standards for school library/media centers. This individual would serve as a contact person for personnel in school library/media centers for consultant services related to interlibrary cooperation.

4. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan actively promote implementation of guidelines in the recent publication of Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) and American Association of School Librarians (AASL), Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs, particularly with respect to funding and staffing for school media centers.**

   New national guidelines for library media programs were adopted by the American Library Association (through the American Association of School Librarians division) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology earlier this year. These **Information Power** guidelines replace the previous 1975 standards. The new guidelines emphasize program concept and structure on a qualitative basis. Quantitative standards are subordinate to the key concepts advocated. A "benchmark" opportunity is available to improve school library media services through implementation of the AASL/AECT **Information Power** guidelines, with particular regard to necessary staff and fiscal support.

5. **Recommend that provision be made for incentive funding for the development and support of multitype cooperatives, including participation by school library/media centers; this should include a review and restructuring of the regions of cooperation.**

Multitype library communication, cooperation and coordination can be very helpful and advantageous to all types of libraries. School library media centers, in particular, can benefit from this type of synergy.

The Regions of Cooperation (ROCs), while helpful in some areas of the state, generally provide uncertain and uneven service to school library media centers and other types of libraries. Their purpose is unclear and organizational relationships are muddled statewide. Regions of Cooperation hold a very real potential for substantive positive impact. It is apparent, however, that thorough review and restructuring of ROCs is necessary before their full contributions to Michigan libraries and their patrons can be realized.

6. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan continue to collect, to maintain and to provide a statistical analysis of all types of Michigan libraries for the purpose of providing current factual information about Michigan libraries.**

   Except for the area of public library statistics, there has been no consistent collection of statistical data about the various types of Michigan libraries which would provide historical documentation and comparative analysis. Librarians seek comparative data in order to gain a clearer understanding about funding, staffing, budget, and technology. A consistent collection of library statistics can provide libraries with an opportunity not only to gain a better understanding of other libraries within the state but also an opportunity to collect and to analyze statistical data at the local level.

7. **Recommend the utilization of technology to promote access to local and special collections by networking and linkage among all types of libraries.**

   Computer technology now permits greater accessibility to collections than ever before. What were once "hidden pockets" of information buried away in collections, can now be accessed through library databases. The Library of Michigan should strongly encourage libraries of all types, perhaps through incentive grants for retrospective conversion, to participate in linking their collections through computer technology. An analysis of each library – school, public, special, and academic – would reveal that every library to some extent has unique holdings. These unique holdings could potentially become part of a statewide network of information resources which will permit the citizens of the State of Michigan to access collections which previously have been unavailable.

8. **Recommend support of a statewide library card, with use of this card tied to incentive reimbursement for the participating libraries.**

   A first step toward statewide interdependency of libraries would be the issuance of the statewide library card – the ticket to use any library. Though some school boards may object to use of school library materials by the general public, probably the greater number of boards may see the value of wider use of school library resources. Additionally, greater public awareness of not only school library collections, but all types of collections may be a fringe benefit of the statewide library card. Incentive funding for libraries which lend materials to "non-residents" in large numbers would encourage all libraries to participate.

9. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan recognize the difficulties that school library/media center personnel encounter in participating in staff development activities, and take an active role in coordinating and making available library staff development in order to provide for continuing opportunities for staff training and education.**

   Staff development activities geared to the needs of school library media specialists are available only in limited numbers in Michigan. The closing of Western Michigan University's librarianship program along with curtailment of off-campus offerings by the University of Michigan create hurdles for persons seeking additional professional training. The Library of Michigan, working in cooperation with universities providing library training, professional organizations such as MAME, and the Michigan Department of Education should spearhead professional training opportunities for school library media professionals on a statewide basis, particularly Northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula.

10. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan take a collaborative role in promoting the value and image of Michigan libraries and librarians, their inter-relationships, and their value to students and to the public.**

    The Library of Michigan is the "number one library" in Michigan related to public recognition. The new building will increase citizen awareness of the institution of the Library of Michigan. With this base of citizen support and recognition, the Library of Michigan is in a perfect position to actively promote Michigan libraries of all types, librarians, and their inherent value to all residents of Michigan. The promotion should use all print and electronic media to saturate Michigan with the library message.

11. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan work actively for the benefit of children and youth in our state through school and public library programs.**

    The Library of Michigan is charged in Public Act 540 to develop effective, statewide school library services "by all appropriate means". To date, the Library of Michigan has limited direct efforts related to school library media programs and centers to collecting statistics to be "preserved and published."

    As school library media centers are the most numerous libraries in the state, serving a very active, captive user group which also represents the future of adult patronage, it is incumbent on the Library of Michigan to facilitate services to the children and youth of Michigan. If our children are our future, they should experience the best possible public as well as school library experiences.

Section 9

Special Libraries Subcommittee Report

Robert Gibson, Chair
Paulette Groen
Nardina Nameth
Charles Wolfe

Special Libraries Subcommittee

Report

I. Special Libraries Subcommittee Charge

The Special Libraries Subcommittee accepted a charge to gather information concerning the relationships of special libraries to other types of Michigan libraries. The broad categories of information were subdivided into four main areas:

A. Gather statistical data on special libraries in Michigan by preparing a survey.

B. Interdependency
   1. Determine participation of special libraries in various networks and groups to share resources and information.
   2. Determine need for state funding of resource sharing.
   3. Determine level of cooperation with other types of libraries.
   4. Determine need for increased funding of the Regions of Cooperation.

C. Relationship with the Library of Michigan
   1. Determine special library use of the Library of Michigan services.
   2. Determine whether other services are seen as a need for Special libraries.

D. Future Needs
   1. Document long-range service and technology needs for special libraries in Michigan.
   2. What resources will be needed to meet these long-range needs? Develop suggested plans for meeting these needs.

II. Nature of Special Libraries

Special libraries represent that segment of the total library community which consists of a variety of sponsoring organizations including law firms, newspapers, industrial corporations, museums, hospitals and governmental agencies. The strength of special libraries is the depth of their collections in a focused subject area.

Survey forms were mailed to 295 libraries and were returned from 168, making a return percentage of 57%. These returns may be broken down into the general area types of:

Law	25
Governmental	16
Medical	65
Industrial	31
Not-for-Profit	10
Other	21

Special libraries are usually small in size although some corporate libraries do not fit this description. Since each special library reflects the information needs of the parent organization, each library's holdings have very specific coverage. Also, each library is very different, one from any other. For example, libraries at Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors are not at all similar even though the main thrust of each of the companies is automotive technology. Each library has its own personality. The common thread of all special libraries is a need to acquire, process, and disseminate information to their clientele. In fact, this same thread exists for all types of libraries.

Although the collections in special libraries are usually restricted in scope, the aggregate for libraries responding to the survey is nearly **1.5 million volumes**. Some of these materials are unique to the various reporting libraries and some of these are not generally available in any other library in the state. Nearly 42,000 magazine titles were reported; some of these also are not generally available.

An important question in the survey covers the area of "special collections" which are a part of the libraries in the state. Little information is now known about these clusters of materials, but they do represent an extremely valuable resource for the residents of Michigan. A separate publication listing these collections should be issued from the Library of Michigan. The report must include a description of the collection; where it is located; and, more importantly for potential users, the availability to other libraries and their patrons. As a result of many special libraries' sharply focused subject coverage, their entire holdings may constitute a special collection.

A few representative collections noted on the survey forms include:

corporate annual reports
history of medicine
car brochures (world wide)
history of public health in Michigan
gerontology
historical collections on problems of minorities and women
automotive history
physical medicine and rehabilitation
history of technology
automation in manufacturing processes and applications (robotics)
food services
fishery science in the Great Lakes
civil rights

One of the major differences between special libraries and other types of libraries is the need for timeliness or speed in answering requests for information. For example, corporate decisions require new information, a doctor needs collaborative information for a diagnosis, or a lawyer must counteract an argument introduced during a court case. In each example, speed and expert knowledge of available sources is essential. Also, because of their more limited clientele, special libraries can push all stops. Accordingly, special libraries embrace new technology to improve the efficiency of information delivery. Nowhere is this fact more graphically demonstrated than in the survey results of online searches. During 1987 95,750 searches were conducted. The broad spectrum of databases utilized in these searches include:

Database	**Number of Libraries Using**	**Database**	**Number of Libraries Using**
OCLC	41	Dialog	86
Questor (Mich.Leg. Service Bur.)	7	Westlaw	15
Bill Status (Mich. Leg. Service Bur.)	8	SDC	14
NLM	55	BRS	48
VUTEXT	41	NEXIS	32
Wilsonline	32	New York Times	3
		LEXIS	30
		other	80

Probably the most important, although less frequently used, was the category of "other". These databases include a broad diversity of subject disciplines. Although some are rather inclusive in nature, most are highly specialized. One major result of increased online searching is that the magazines which are printed out are frequently not a part of the searching library's collection. These references are important to the requesting patron and, accordingly, interlibrary loans from other libraries are increasing significantly.

Most of the reporting libraries have also felt a need for creating internal databases, many of which are computer produced and searched. Some examples of these databases include:

- in-house company technical reports
- 10,000 articles in the area of filtration
- company product literature
- catalog of films, videos and audio tapes
- management speeches
- in-house memoranda and correspondence
- theses
- automotive road tests

Some of these databases are for company use only, but others are available to the general public.

III. Interdependency

A. The tradition of cooperation among libraries is alive and well among special libraries in Michigan. The largest cooperative activity among special libraries is interlibrary loans, closely followed by serials union listing, i.e., centralized listing of magazines owned by Michigan libraries. The two programs are closely related, since effective interloaning requires an accurate union list of serial titles. Cooperative collection development is a coordinated program for acquiring library materials in a cost effective manner. Such programs range in formality from the multitype Council on Resource Development (CORD) to agreements between libraries which reduce duplication and free up resources for other subscriptions and books. Interloan, union listing, and collection development are all related in that they make possible the sharing of resources for special libraries. Library managers are willing to take on the tremendous amount of work necessary to coordinate these activities in order to make information available for the diverse and unpredictable requests generated by the clientele of special libraries.

The survey results indicate that special libraries do provide some services to outside clientele:

	Number of Libraries Who	
Service	**Charge**	**No Charge**
audiovisual materials	4	19
circulation of materials	5	41
database services	14	10
interlibrary loan	13	71
literature searches	18	18
photocopy service	30	46
reference service	6	60

Special libraries continue to be involved in interlibrary loans. Although special libraries borrowed more than they lend, it should be noted that they also provide many other services to outside requestors. Interlibrary loan statistics indicate that special libraries lent some 64,607 items and borrowed 117,855. A feeling that they should be paying their own way probably supports special library provision of other services to outside requestors. The time constraints discussed earlier do cause some of the special library interlibrary loan needs. Direct purchase of the needed information is often far too slow a process. The survey showed that special libraries feel a strong need for greater and easier access to the collections of the academic and public libraries. However, the respondents were quick to acknowledge that additional use of these collections would necessitate some reimbursement to the lending organization.

B. State funding for resource sharing will be an important contribution to access of all types of library materials, but "funding for resource sharing" means different things to different types of libraries. Special libraries are oriented to the information requirements of their organizations and their collections and services are designed around their organization's needs. Because of this concentration, each library develops as a specialized collection. The strength of special libraries is this depth of their collections in a focused subject area. The diversity of needed information outside these focused areas requires rapid access to other library collections.

State funding could help special libraries, as well as other types of libraries, to share information. Some projects needing state funding include:

1. Capital equipment projects
    a. telefax for all libraries
    b. personal computers

2. Conversion of collections to machine-readable format

3. Development of look-alike access protocols to NOTIS online catalogs in Michigan

4. Coordinated collection development projects in specialized subject areas which would benefit multitype cooperation in an area such as health education for the general public.

C. A total of 66 special libraries reported some action in cooperation in reference work. The services most frequently mentioned include general reference such as answers from standard handbooks or encyclopedias, providing literature searches to other libraries, and providing information on specific topics to public libraries. Although much of this activity takes place between libraries of the same type, considerable cooperation between different types of libraries does exist. Referral of patrons and reference questions is an important part of this interaction and is an example of informal cooperation among the libraries.

Cooperation between different types of libraries can be enhanced by funding new technologies which will improve efficiency and accuracy within existing networks. Greater utilization of resources and eliminate unnecessary referrals out of state.

D. The Regions of Cooperation are the natural mechanism for organizing and funding new multitype library cooperation between different types of libraries. The effectiveness of the ROC program should be enhanced by making policies, procedures and funding priorities more uniform throughout the state. After these organizational changes, increased funding of the ROCs themselves and of the grants flowing through the

ROCs to all library types would be an excellent method of implementing new Library of Michigan programs.

Many of the special libraries are currently members of local ROCs; over 100 so noted on their survey returns. All special libraries should be encouraged to join their regions of cooperation as the ROCs tend to integrate the various types of libraries for the benefit of all.

The Regions of Cooperation should be formalized through state legislation. Thus, the ROCs could serve as central coordination points for the school and special libraries who now have a more limited access to state and national resource networks.

IV. Relationships with the Library of Michigan

A. Few special libraries indicated that they had any active relationship with the Library of Michigan. This answer was not wholly unexpected. The special library image of the Library of Michigan is that it functions primarily for and through the public libraries. Unfortunately, this perception of the Library of Michigan perpetuates Michigan's splintered library community.

B. The need for other services for special libraries is quite evident, but the Library of Michigan will need to expand its leadership, education, and coordination role for all types of libraries. The inauguration of the Task Force on Funding by the State Library Board was a step in this direction. It is only natural that all types of libraries look to the Library of Michigan as their state leader. The Library of Michigan, in turn, is uniquely qualified to fulfill this role.

Some possible areas for additional Library of Michigan leadership:

1. Continue to collect and analyze statistical data from all types of libraries. The current survey is a good beginning and the data collected for the Task Force report can provide a baseline for future surveys.
2. Provide guidelines for automating access to all major libraries in Michigan so that user/access/interfaces to the systems are similar. Most libraries will soon have terminals for online searching. Their purchase and use could be coordinated so that these same terminals can also access the state database.
3. Provide funding and resources to enable special libraries as well as the smaller public libraries with small staffs and small budgets to list their holdings in existing systems.
4. Increase attention towards providing continuing library education. The Library of Michigan is in an excellent position to survey the educational needs of the state's librarians. The Library

of Michigan is also in a good position to coordinate programs to meet these needs. A unified calendar of educational opportunities from all library groups within Michigan would not only increase awareness of what programs are available to all librarians, but it would also avoid unnecessary duplication of workshops.

5. Establish a new staff position to coordinate special library services.

6. Provide the infrastructure for all library service in Michigan. The plan should include:

    a) ports for access to the Library of Michigan online catalog

    b) subsidies for installation of additional ports into the major university online catalogs for access by Michigan libraries

    c) a Michigan library network

    d) addition of all state agency collections to the NOTIS database

    e) support of FAX for all libraries

    f) funding for demonstration projects

7. Provide support for statewide library cooperation, especially interlibrary loans and resource sharing as an area development tool.

V. Future Needs

Technology is rapidly changing the information world, and all libraries will experience dramatic changes during the foreseeable future. Technology requires education for successful implementation, and it requires leadership and flexibility to gain acceptance and widespread application. The Library of Michigan could assume an active role in coordinating the research and development taking place in library schools and the information industry which is required by the professionals out in the field who are applying this technology. The continuing problem exists in that we no sooner adjust to our new online catalogs and telefacsimile when CD-ROM becomes available and then something beyond that technology. Change is a fact of life in information technology, a fact which becomes a real challenge for all types of libraries.

The survey results indicate a consensus that librarians want more technology and that they require direction in how to select and utilize the technology in their libraries. Also, educational programs which educate librarians about the technological choices ahead and funding programs to acquire the technology are both essential for the future development of libraries in Michigan.

Several respondents also suggested a major need for a program to both inform and change the libraries' and librarians' image. Michigan residents do not seem to realize the vast information resources that are now available to them, and the role of libraries and librarians in delivering that information.

VI. Innovative Funding Mechanisms

A. Since libraries and education seem to be a logical combination, perhaps one penny could be set aside for libraries from each of the lottery tickets sold. This plan would add a sum that, when added to the current legislative support for libraries, would make a reasonable baseline support for libraries and the various programs recommended on the special library survey returns.

B. Confiscated "drug" money – cash, equipment, and other valuables – which are to be sold, could be used for new library support.

VII. Conclusion

Special libraries in Michigan represent a segment of the total library community that has great potential for supporting the information needs of the other types of libraries in the state. However, up to now, this potential has been largely unrealized.

The Library of Michigan should exercise its responsibility for library leadership in funding, capital equipment, networking and continuing education to improve the effectiveness of Michigan's libraries in meeting the information needs for their clientele – Michigan residents.

Special Libraries Subcommittee

Summary of Recommendations

1. **Recommend that the State of Michigan increase its funding to the Library of Michigan so that the library can adequately fulfill its mission of leadership for all types of libraries in Michigan.**

   The Library of Michigan should expand its leadership, educational, and coordination role for all types of libraries. It is only natural that the library community of Michigan should look to the Library of Michigan as their internal leader. The Library of Michigan is uniquely qualified to fulfill this role. However, it is also imperative that the Library of Michigan receive sufficient funding for this role.

2. **Recommend that the regions of cooperation be formalized through legislation so that all types of libraries could have equal access to the state's library resources. Increased funding for the regions of cooperation is also necessary.**

   The Regions of Cooperation are the natural mechanism for organizing and funding new multitype library cooperation. The ROCs should be formalized through the state legislature so they could also serve the school and special libraries who currently have limited access to state resource networks. ROCs should also be reorganized so that policies, procedures, and funding priorities are uniform statewide. All special libraries should be encouraged to join a ROC. ROCs should be a regular part of the state funding after the legislative change in status.

3. **Recommend that funding and resources be provided to enable the smaller public libraries and special libraries to include their holdings in existing union lists.**

   The majority of special libraries are small, as are many public libraries. Yet these libraries contain many items of unique value. Because of their limited resources, it is almost impossible for most of these libraries to commit part of their budgets toward the cost of inputting the information into a statewide database. State funding support would increase the overall value of the database.

4. **Recommend establishment of a statewide library network. Financial support will be necessary to enable the "have-nots" to be an integral part of either an electronic mail system or a statewide "fax" system.**

   Rapid communication by all of the state's libraries is needed. Provision of a statewide library network could be accomplished by either a relatively cheap electronic mail system, a "fax" system, or some other network system. The present support for "fax" equipment could be extended. Financial support is necessary to enable some of the smaller libraries to become part of a statewide network. The network would provide Michigan's citizens with a more effective and efficient library service.

5. **Recommend that a new position be established on the Library of Michigan staff to coordinate special library services.**

   A staff position should be created to unify services for the special library segment of the library community. The position should be filled by a special librarian. Such an addition to the staff would benefit the Library of Michigan's understanding of special libraries, their problems, and their potential contribution to all libraries.

6. **Recommend that a new program be initiated to aid the librarians in the state to select and utilize the new technologies in their libraries. Demonstration projects should be provided.**

   Technology is rapidly changing the information world, and all libraries will experience dramatic changes in the future. The Library of Michigan should assume an active role in providing the direction that the librarians indicated in their survey returns are needed to select and to utilize these new technologies. The changes are occurring so rapidly that it is nearly impossible for individual librarians to keep current.

7. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan issue a new separate publication listing special collections in Michigan's libraries. Such a listing would provide increased information for Michigan's residents.**

   Little information is currently available about the "special collections" which are a part of all types of libraries' holdings. Frequently these collections are not even in the library's cataloged data. Survey returns identified the existence of these "special collections". If a comprehensive description of these materials and their availability to Michigan's residents were included in a publication, a considerable new body of information would become available for research.

8. **Recommend development of a plan to promote cooperative collection development as a way to "stretch" libraries' funds for materials.**

   The Library of Michigan should take the lead in developing a plan to encourage contributions by all types of libraries into a common pool of funds which could be spent to purchase very expensive items which most libraries cannot afford by themselves. These materials could be placed in the Library of Michigan or other designated location. By following such a plan, such items would be available to all Michigan residents.

9. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan fully utilize its unique position to survey the educational needs of the state's librarians and to coordinate programs to meet these needs.**

   The Library of Michigan is in an excellent position to coordinate continuing library education. The Library of Michigan should survey the educational needs of the state's librarians. A unified calendar of educational opportunities from all library groups would increase awareness of available programs as well as to help avoid unnecessary duplication of workshops.

10. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan develop a plan to both inform and change the current image that Michigan residents have of their libraries.**

    The survey results indicated that many librarians felt a strong need for a public relations program that would inform Michigan residents of the vast library resources and services available to them. The old images of libraries as mere storehouses of old books and of librarians who are there only to check out books or to collect fines are still prevalent. The Library of Michigan should help to change this image.

11. **Recommend that the Library of Michigan continue to annually collect and analyze statistical data from all types of libraries.**

    The Library of Michigan has had a responsibility for collecting statistical information about the various Michigan libraries. However, most of their effort has gone to the public libraries as these statistics have been required for fund allocations. The Task Force Survey has provided initial statistics for all types of libraries and the Library of Michigan should continue collecting and analyzing similar statistics annually.

12. **Recommend the provision of guidelines for automating access to all major libraries in Michigan so that user/access/interfaces to the systems are similar.**

    Currently, Michigan's libraries are using many different software programs to access their own databases. Effective interface can be provided by establishing guidelines for similar access to these systems so they can be used more easily by all libraries.

13. **Recommend that an equipment laboratory be created to assist practicing librarians in the evaluation and selection of new information technologies. Hardware, software and peripherals could be provided for comparison of various features.**

    A centralized location where various equipment and systems could be compared would aid librarians to make decisions for acquiring new technologies. The Library of Michigan should provide the location where hardware, software and peripherals could be provided for comparison of various features.

14. **Recommend the provision of adequate numbers of ports for general library access to the Library of Michigan online catalog.**

    Any recommendation that suggests additions to the NOTIS database carries with it an implicit need for additional ports into the NOTIS system for access. Agency library and general library "special collection" additions to the database indicate increased need for entry into the system.

15. **Recommend the establishment of a statewide library card as a method of improving patron access to the state's information.**

    One hurdle preventing the public's use of our state's library resources is the lack of a statewide library card. Although many special libraries do not allow circulation of some of their materials, others do, and the lack of any mechanism hinders full use. Some compensation should be available to offset costs of the increased volume of transactions. The Pennsylvania Plan should be studied as a model of one plan that has worked.

16. **Recommend development of a statewide plan for centralized storage of older, lesser used library materials. A method for rapid delivery of needed items is a requisite of the plan.**

    Most special libraries have serious space problems and are forced to remove books from their collections regularly. Many of these items are still valuable but are no longer of immediate interest to the library and must be disposed of to make space. A central location for storage of withdrawn, but still valuable items would allow libraries to use their space more effectively, but would also keep these items available in the state. Magazine and journal runs could be handled in the same manner. A method for rapidly distributing copies of journal articles or parts of books via "fax" to libraries in Michigan would provide an important service to all.

17. **Recommend that all state agency library collections be entered into the NOTIS database.**

    A first significant step towards building a statewide database would be the inputting of the various state agency library collections into the Library of Michigan's NOTIS system.

18. **Recommend that support be provided for statewide library cooperation, especially interlibrary loans and resource sharing as an area development tool.**

    Survey results indicate a wealth of library resources that have been relatively untapped because their existence was not widely known. Much of this information can be shared to the benefit of Michigan's residents by statewide interlibrary loaning. Support is needed to prepare a database that all libraries can utilize to locate the items.

Library of Michigan
P.O. Box 30007, 717 West Allegan Street, Lansing, MI 48909
Administration: 517-373-1580. Information: 517-373-5400.

89-006
11/88